FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-112
Monday
11 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-112 CONTENTS 11 June 1990

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- 'Memorandum' Cited on NATO Use of Missiles *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Jun]* ... 1
- TASS Views Outcome of NATO, Pact Meetings ... 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

- Further Reportage on Warsaw Pact Meeting ... 2
  - Comment in IZVESTIYA *[9 Jun]* ... 2
  - Kvitsinskiy Holds News Conference *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 9 Jun]* ... 3
  - Timing of Changes Set *[TASS]* ... 3
  - Pact Leaders Comment on Outcome *[PRAVDA 8 Jun]* ... 4
  - Pact Leaders Cited Further *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* ... 4
  - Jaruzelski, Antall Interviewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 9 Jun]* ... 5
  - Jaruzelski, Falin Comment on Pact *[Vienna TV]* ... 6
  - Hungarian Spokesman Comments *[Budapest Radio]* ... 6
  - Antall Comments on Talks *[TASS]* ... 7
  - Comparison on Pact Meeting Ends ... 7

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- TASS Reports on Two-Plus-Four Talks ... 9
- Reportage on Meeting of NATO Foreign Ministers ... 9
  - Communique Stresses Security *[TASS]* ... 9
  - IZVESTIYA Views Meeting *[9 Jun]* ... 10
  - More Cooperation Predicted *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* ... 10
  - 'Constructive Line' Noted *[Moscow International]* ... 11
- Roundtable Program Views Future of NATO, Pact *[Moscow Radio]* ... 11
- Reportage on Current Events Regarding CSCE ... 13
  - Helsinki Process Analyzed *[TASS]* ... 13
  - Progress of Talks Noted *[TASS]* ... 14
  - Reshetov Addresses Conference *[TASS]* ... 14
- Moiseyev Reaffirms Pledge To Finish Arms Talks *[Moscow International]* ... 15
- Cocom Partially Eases Export Restrictions *[Moscow International]* ... 15

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- U.S. Senate Committee Opposes New Embassy Funds *[TASS]* ... 16
- Reportage, Commentary Continue on Gorbachev Visit ... 16
  - Bush Comments on Summit *[TASS]* ... 16
  - Bush Cited on New Era *[TASS]* ... 17
  - Reagan Cited on Summit *[TASS]* ... 17
  - Results Assessed *[TASS]* ... 17

Northeast Asia

- Further Reportage on Gorbachev-No Tae-u Meeting ... 18
  - Gorbachev Aides Reject Agreements *[Moscow International]* ... 18
  - Meeting To Promote Korean Peace *[Moscow International]* ... 18

  - Bush, No Tae-u Discuss Talks *[Moscow International]* 18
  - ROK President on Talks With Gorbachev *[TASS]* 18
  - Diplomatic Relations Not Confirmed *[Moscow TV]* 18
  - ROK To Normalize Ties With PRC *[Moscow International]* 19
  - No Tae-u's Probable Visit to Beijing *[Moscow International]* 19
  - No Urges Talks With Kim Il-song *[Moscow International]* 19
  - Ovchinnikov on Impact of Talks *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 19
  - Commentary on Meeting *[Moscow International]* 20
- North Korea Returns Remains of U.S. Soldiers *[Moscow International]* 21

Southeast Asia & Pacific

- Shevardnadze Meets With Cambodia's Hun Sen *[TASS]* 21
  - Tokyo Talks Evaluated *[PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 22
  - Alekseyev on Meeting's Results *[Moscow International]* 22
- Cambodian Rubber Production, Delivery Disrupted *[PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 23

East Europe

- Polish Government Cited on Economic Achievements *[PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 23
- Further on Gorbachev's Meeting With Jaruzelski *[PRAVDA 8 Jun]* 23
- Hungary's Antall Thanks Ryzhkov for Greetings *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 24
- Ryzhkov, Antall Discuss Bilateral Relations *[TASS]* 24

West Europe

- Further on Visit of British Prime Minister 24
  - Joint News Conference 8 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 24
  - Thatcher Applauds 'Historic Changes' *[TASS]* 33
  - Gorbachev Appraises Talks *[TASS]* 33
  - Gorbachev on Market Economy *[TASS]* 34
  - Thatcher, Gorbachev on Israel *[TASS]* 34
  - Gorbachev on Cooperation With Yeltsin *[TASS]* 34
  - Gorbachev, Thatcher View Pact, NATO *[TASS]* 35
  - Gorbachev's Dinner Speech *[TASS]* 35
  - Further on Gorbachev Speech *[TASS]* 37
  - Gorbachev Discusses German Unity *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]* 37
  - Thatcher's Dinner Speech *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 38
  - Leaders Attend Dinner for Thatcher *[Moscow TV]* 39
  - Thatcher on Gorbachev's 'Survival' *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]* 39
  - Praises Perestroyka, Gorbachev *[TASS]* 40
  - Gorbachev-Thatcher Talks Reviewed *[Moscow TV]* 40
  - TASS Reviews Meetings 41
  - Thatcher, Ryzhkov Discuss Reforms *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 42
  - Departs Moscow for Kiev *[TASS]* 42
  - Signs Joint Gas Industry Agreement *[Moscow Radio]* 42
  - Meets With Defense Minister *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jun]* 43
  - Gorbachev Greeting to British Festival *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]* 43
  - Shmelev Comments on Visit *[TASS]* 43
  - Improved Relations To Help Unify Europe *[Moscow International]* 44

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

- Moscow TV Reports 8 Jun Supreme Soviet Session 45
- Supreme Soviet Completes Debate on Media Bill *[TASS]* 45
- Supreme Soviet Committee Adopts Porn Statement *[Moscow TV]* 45
- People's Deputies Set Up Security Review Group *[MOSCOW NEWS No 22]* 46

Political & Social

Gorbachev Interviewed by BBC 8 Jun *[London TV]* 46
Medvedev Chairs Group Forming Congress Program 49
  Medvedev Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 49
  Working Group Meets *[TASS]* 49
  Medvedev Addresses Group *[Moscow TV]* 50
New Name for Communist Party To Be Discussed *[AFP]* 52
Russians Denounce Television Blackout on Yeltsin *[AFP]* 52
Readiness To Clear Up Wallenberg Case Renewed *[AFP]* 52
Coal Miners' Congress Scheduled for 11 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 53
Peasants Union Inaugural Congress Opens 11 Jun 53
  Congress Previewed *[Moscow Radio]* 53
  Gorbachev, Others Attend *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Orthodox Church Elects New Patriarch 53
  Aleksiy Chosen *[TASS]* 53
  Gorbachev Sends Congratulations *[TASS]* 53
  Reception Honors Aleksiy *[TASS]* 53
Komsomol Draft Laws Discussed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 May]* 54
'Centrist' Forces Unite at Moscow Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 54
Russian Democratic Party Splits Into Factions *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Bolshoy Theater Workers Begin Hunger Strike *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Decontamination Work in Moscow Park *[Moscow Radio]* 55

Economic

Soviet Economist Claims Reforms 'Bound To Fail' *[Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE 2 Jun]* 56
Bogomolov Examines Economic Reform Program *[MOSCOW NEWS No 22]* 57
Problems of Economic Conversion Discussed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 22]* 59
Draft RSFSR Economic Sovereignty Concept *[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN No 21]* 60

Agricultural

Ligachev Comments on Swedish Agro-Industry *[Moscow TV]* 70
Farm Chairman Cited on 'Burden' of State Order *[Moscow TV]* 71
Thriving Kolkhoz in Ukraine Examined *[Moscow TV]* 71
Agricultural Developments For 24 May-6 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* 72

Scientific

Further Reportage on 'Kristall-Mir' Docking 72
  Ground Control 'Optimistic' *[Moscow International]* 72
  'Kristall' Orbit Corrected *[Moscow International]* 72
  Rendezvous Maneuver Executed *[TASS]* 72
  Docking Occurs 10 Jun *[TASS]* 73
Data About Chlorine Leak Possibly 'Concealed' *[Helsinki International]* 73
New Passenger Catamaran Completes Sea Trials *[Moscow TV]* 73
AIDS Conference Predicts Epidemic 'in 5 Years' *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]* 73

Military

Military Chiefs Win CPSU Congress Places *[PRAVDA 7 Jun]* 74
'Victimization' of Reform Advocates Protested *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Jun]* 74
Airborne Commander Views Military Reform *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 May]* 75
Komin on Price Reform's Impact on Armed Forces *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Jun]* 77
*Nuclear Test Veteran Cited on 'Social Justice' *[TRUD 6 Jun]* 78
Yazov Presents Defense Ministry Prizes to Writers *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Jun]* 78

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Brazauskas Cited on Aims of Moscow Visit *[TASS]* 79
Gorbachev Decree on Amnesty Law Published *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 79
  More on Decree *[TASS]* 79
  Lithuanian Official on Decree *[Vilnius Radio]* 79
Lithuanian Economic, Energy Situation Updated *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
  More on Energy Supply *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Locomotives Begin Withdrawal From Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Lithuanian Nuclear Generators Activated *[Vilnius Radio]* 81
Lithuania Denies 'Allegedly Softened' Blockade *[Vilnius International]* 81
Vessels Barred From Fishing in 'Foreign Sounds' *[Vilnius International]* 81
Brazauskas Interviewed on TV Appearance *[Vilnius Radio]* 81
Lithuanian Council Views Social, Economic Issues *[Vilnius International]* 81
Economist Urges Suspension of Declaration, Talks *[TASS]* 82
Lizichev Interviewed on Lithuanian Issues *[Moscow TV]* 82
Visas Denied for Vilnius Human Rights Conference *[Vilnius International]* 83
Further on Split of Estonian Communist Party *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jun]* 83
Rubiks Interviewed on Goals of Party *[Moscow TV]* 84
Rubiks Addresses Latvian Party Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 84
Godmanis Views Independence, Internal Tensions *[MOSCOW NEWS No 22]* 85
Latvia Sees Signature Collection as 'Provocation' *[Vilnius International]* 86
Latvian Party, Media Exchange Accusations *[Riga Radio]* 86
Latvian Republic Ministers Appointed *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 17, 19, 22 May]* 87
Baltic Leaders Discuss Results of Talks *[Riga Radio]* 87
Baltic Foreign Ministers Visit Norway *[TASS]* 88
More Reporting on Baltic Council Meeting *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Jun]* 88
Baltic Selective View of History Attacked *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jun]* 89

RSFSR

Further on Sovereignty Issue Debate *[TASS]* 91
Yeltsin on Alleged Ban of Television Interview *[Moscow TV]* 91
  Gorbachev Denies Blocking Broadcast *[Moscow Radio]* 92
  More on Denial *[TASS]* 92
Yeltsin Interviewed on Congress Proceedings *[Moscow TV]* 93
Moscow TV Relays 9 June Congress Proceedings 95
  Yeltsin on TV Broadcast 95
  TV Chief on Dispute 96
  Voting Results Read 96
  Speech Delay Explained 97
  More on Elections 98
  Consensus Urged 98
  Nominations Continue 99
Congress Elects Supreme Soviet Deputies *[TASS]* 99
'Acute Polemics' at Congress Session Noted *[TASS]* 100
Moscow TV Relays 8 June Congress Proceedings 100
  Election Procedures Explained 100
  Sovereignty Debated 101
  Declaration Debated 102
  More on Debates 103
  Agricultural Report Given 103
  More on Report 104
Yeltsin Gets Congress Backing For TV Address *[Moscow TV]* 105
Gorbachev Chairs Joint Russian Party Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 105
  More on Preparations *[TASS]* 106
Shabanov Elected Voronezh Oblast First Secretary *[Moscow Radio]* 106

Caucasus

Attacks on Army Increasing in Transcaucasus *[TASS]* ... 106
Troops Ask Supreme Soviet for Armenia Action *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* ... 107
Thatcher Arrives in Leninakhan 10 Jun ... 107
  Thousands Mob Thatcher *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]* ... 107
  Yerevan Reports Visit *[Yerevan Radio]* ... 108
Azerbaijan Party Congress Opens 8 Jun ... 108
  Agenda Viewed *[Baku Radio]* ... 108
  Mutalibov Defends Leading Role *[Moscow Radio]* ... 109
  Congress Continues 9 Jun *[Baku Radio]* ... 109
  Mutalibov Reelected Party Chief *[TASS]* ... 110
  Congress Concludes 9 Jun *[Moscow TV]* ... 110
Azerbaijan Popular Front Calls for Cooperation *[Istanbul TERCUMAN 7 Jun]* ... 110
Tense Situation in Kazakhskiy Rayon Reported *[Baku Radio]* ... 110
Interethnic Situation Stabilized in Azerbaijan *[Baku Radio]* ... 111
Attack on Azeri Village Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Jun]* ... 111
Abovyanskiy Rayon Committee Official Replaced *[Yerevan Radio]* ... 111

Central Asia

Kirghiz Residents Begin Day of Mourning *[TASS]* ... 112
Kirghiz Blockade Threatens Fuel Reserves *[TASS]* ... 112
TASS Reports Situation in Osh 'Stabilized' ... 112
Kirghiz Minister Says Situation Improving *[Moscow Radio]* ... 113
Uzbek, Kirghiz Leaders View 'Tragic Events' *[Tashkent Radio]* ... 113
Kirghiz Premier Accepts Blame, Outlines Plans *[Moscow Radio]* ... 114
Troops 'Entirely' Control Uzgen in Kirghizia *[Moscow TV]* ... 114
Kirghizia Death Toll Reaches 115 *[Moscow Radio]* ... 114
Kirghiz Authorities Anticipate 'Complex' Situation *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]* ... 115
Kirghiz Communist Party, Government Issue Appeal *[Frunze Radio]* ... 116
  More on Appeal *[Frunze Radio]* ... 116
Frunze Forces Given Order To Open Fire *[AFP]* ... 117
Frunze, Osh, Andizhan Situation Updated *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* ... 117
Uzbek Districts Under Emergency Named *[TASS]* ... 118
  More on State of Emergency *[TASS]* ... 118
'Kirghizstan' Democratic Movement Formed *[SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA 29 May]* ... 119
Tajikistan Curbs Exports of Food, Consumer Goods *[Moscow TV]* ... 119
Kazakh Plenum Lists New Party Officials *[Alma-Ata Radio]* ... 119

'Memorandum' Cited on NATO Use of Missiles

PM0706122390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 First Edition p3

[TASS report: "Secret Memorandum"]

[Text] London, 4 Jun—"Tomahawk" cruise missiles installed on U.S. warships and submarines could be placed at the disposal of the NATO Command in the event of a "crisis situation" arising. These plans are envisioned in a so-called "memorandum of agreement" adopted by the leadership of the North Atlantic alliance and still being kept strictly secret from the public and parliaments of countries in the alliance. This has been reported by the newspaper THE INDEPENDENT.

With regard to Britain's role in the implementation of these plans, the newspaper reminds us that, under the terms of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, the process of withdrawing U.S. land-based intermediate-range missiles from the country's territory is currently under way. At the same time, U.S. nuclear submarines equipped with these missiles are still stationed at the naval base in Holy Loch (Scotland). Moreover, the British leadership is continuing to "press within NATO for British air force free-fall nuclear bombs to be replaced with air-launched intermediate-range missiles." Although the country's Defence Ministry stubbornly refuses to confirm these plans, they fit in well with the NATO Command's "memorandum of agreement," THE INDEPENDENT believes.

According to the newspaper, this secret memorandum "is an integral part of the general strategy to move away from land-based intermediate-range nuclear missile systems in Europe in favor of air- and sea-launched systems."

TASS Views Outcome of NATO, Pact Meetings

LD0906181790 Moscow TASS in English 1759 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS—It will be no exaggeration to say that not a single communique of sessions of NATO leading bodies ever abounded in such a large number of optimistic forecasts and conclusions as the final document of the NATO Council session which ended on June 8.

Perhaps, not a single official document of NATO contained such a limited number of allusions to "military might". It is also noteworthy that the presentation of these allusions by NATO ministers has become much less tough, and this is a sure sign of changes that have taken place in the world since 1985.

One can only welcome the NATO Council's statement about the readiness of the members of the western alliance to make "reasonable compromises" at the Vienna talks and about instructions to their delegations in Vienna to develop new approaches towards achieving mutually acceptable solutions, specifically over aircraft, tanks and verification procedure, evaluation of the importance of the latest Soviet-American summit and NATO's intention to change its military strategy.

It so happened that NATO Council's two-day session in Turnberry, Scotland, at foreign ministers' level was held simultaneously with the Moscow meeting of the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO) attended by the heads of state and government of Warsaw Treaty countries.

The leaders of the two alliances' member countries at these two sessions discussed similar problems. Naturally, one is tempted to compare—digressing from the style of the two final communiques—the actual positions of the sides on major problems connected with European security and to identify still remaining differences of their approaches.

The Warsaw Treaty countries at the PCC meeting stated that conditions are now ripe for overcoming the blocs-type system of security and in this connection decided to begin to review the character, functions and activities of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation.

The NATO ministers, for their part, again emphasised the invariability of the fundamental properties of the alliance. In this respect one can note a more dynamic response by two countries to the rapid changes in the world and their readiness to more vigorously bring their military and political guidelines into conformity with realities.

WTO and NATO representatives, both in Moscow and Turnberry, supported the idea of institutionalising the Helsinki process.

Participants in the PCC meeting emphasised that the realisation of this idea would be an important contribution to strengthening European stability.

The NATO Council session, however, pointed out that the North Atlantic alliance should remain the "cornerstone" in building a new European order while CSCE functions should only supplement NATO's functions.

The PCC declaration says that "the confrontational elements contained in the WTO and NATO documents of the past years no longer accord with the spirit of the times".

Noteworthy is quite a reasonable statement on that score by NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner at the close of the session in Turnberry. He said that if NATO wants adequately to respond to the challenge of the times, it itself should change.

Further Reportage on Warsaw Pact Meeting

Comment in IZVESTIYA

PM0806155090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Vitaliy Kobysh's "Political Observer's Opinion" column: "The Warsaw Pact Invites..."]

[Text] To those who had already buried the Warsaw Pact Organization—and there were plenty of them, in the United States and Europe, including our own country—the very fact of the holding of a conference of the organization's Political Consultative Committee in Moscow came as a surprise.

After the turbulent events and change of regimes in each of the Warsaw Pact member countries, it was indeed possible to doubt whether the heads of state and government would sit at the negotiating table, as had happened for 35 years, and be able in a few hours to reach agreement on the fundamental problems of today. First and foremost, of course, is the situation in Europe, as is clearly visible from the content of the declaration of the Warsaw Pact member states published today.

But let us not exaggerate anything. The participants in this top-level conference represent states that differ greatly from one another, and in the course of the discussions they presumably expressed different viewpoints on individual questions. It would doubtless look odd if that were not the case: After all, stormy debates are in progress within each of these countries, clashes of opinions on problems that are by no means exclusively domestic. Nonetheless the gloomy predictions that the leaders of the Warsaw Pact states this time will fail not only to take any decisions but even to find a common language at all, were not in the least justified. They immediately managed to find a common language and to outline a range of problems of priority importance. There are many problems, very many, but they concentrated on what is most important.

First. European structures, existing or only just emerging—the architecture, so to speak, of the future Europe—guaranteeing the continent's inhabitants lasting peace, good and peaceful cooperation, and generally a normal human life. Here there is much to talk about. Our idea of the "common European home." President G. Bush's call for an "integral and free Europe." President F. Mitterrand's idea of a European confederation. The "European peace order" advocated by the FRG. All these ideas are closely related in substance, and if their implementation is taken to its logical conclusion, it will result in an end both to military bloc confrontation and to coexistence on a bloc basis itself. What will replace them? Today a clear answer can be given with a good degree of confidence to this question: an all-European security system of which the concrete, material basis is provided by the Helsinki accords, a kind of peace charter adopted in the Finnish capital at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). In other words, it is a question of synchronizing the process of ending bloc confrontation with the political and disarmament process on the basis of the CSCE.

Everything mentioned here is already becoming a reality, or at least is very close to reality. In his recent interview for TIME magazine, M.S. Gorbachev interpreted this as follows: "I see Europe as a unique alliance of states with common institutions in the sphere of miltiary and ecological security and economic, scientific, and cultural collaboration. Each will retain its own social and national identity and is entitled to uphold its own special interests as long as this is not to the detriment of others. Borders should remain immutable, but they will acquire a new quality—a wide and deep permeability for all types of cooperation and contact based on equal rights and respect." The general purport of the declaration of the Warsaw Pact member states published today, which it probably will not now occur to anyone to say was adopted under "pressure from Moscow," is, as you can see, fully in harmony with the program expounded by the USSR president.

The rapid march of time and problems heaped one upon another prevented the conference participants from offering a detailed interpretation of everything that concerns people. They are, of course, concerned primarily about the German problem in its various aspects, including the role and place of a united Germany in NATO military policy. Here, alas, there are still more than enough questions requiring interpretation.

Second. The participants in the Political Consultative Committee conference—as it emerges from the declaration they adopted—devoted great attention to a review of the nature, functions, and activities of the Warsaw Pact, proceeding from the premise that its military functions should give way to political activity and also to cooperation in the sphere of the economy, ecology, and culture. The ideological image of the enemy, which has largely been overcome by the joint efforts of East and West (the very terms East and West are regaining their purely geographical significance), gives NATO leaders the opportunity to approach the activity of their own organization with the same yardsticks. [sentence as published] NATO, the initiator of the cold war, the arms race, and the whipping up of the danger of war, has no right to exist at all in its former form. The guarantee of security in Europe now will not be military force but peaceful cooperation between NATO and the Warsaw Pact in resolving the European peoples' pressing problems, which will inevitably lead to an existence without blocs for our continent and at the same time the normalization of the situation throughout the world. The Warsaw Pact is setting a good exmaple. We hope it will be taken up by the other side.

In a rapidly changing world the Political Consultative Committee conference is a very important event paving the way to a peaceful future for mankind. The Declaration of the Warsaw Pact Member States offers clear pointers along this only possible path.

Kvitsinskiy Holds News Conference

PM0906175190 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 9 Jun 90 p 3

[TASS diplomatic correspondent I. Novikov report from USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center: "Political Consultative Committee Conference: In an Atmosphere of Accord"]

[Text] A news conference in Moscow 7 June was devoted to the results of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee [PCC] conference. Addressing Soviet and foreign journalists, Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, pointed out that the conference was an outstanding milestone in the life and subsequent development of the political-defensive alliance, soon to celebrate its 35th anniversary. Two internally interconnected questions were discussed—prospects for the development of the European process and for security and the strengthening of stability on the continent, and prospects for revising the nature, functions, and activity of the Warsaw Pact.

This conference, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said, proved that the Warsaw Pact is, despite numerous gloomy forecasts that have been voiced of late, a living, active organization that is able to offer a keen and fitting response to the challenges of the time. The turbulent changes in East Europe, the profound changes in the political landscape there attest that new structures for stability and cooperation must be created by using all the continent's existing instruments—alliances, organizations, associations. All these elements were analyzed in depth during the conference. Far-reaching decisions were adopted. Mechanisms for their implementation and timetables for their execution were determined.

What is the essence of the adopted decisions? Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy stressed that the Warsaw Pact will be radically transformed. In the process the stress will be laid on its political and consultative aspect. It goes without saying that certain outmoded structures are to be revised, and the pact's activity will be organized in a new way in many areas. All this in order to ensure that the Warsaw Pact is able to fulfill the pressing tasks posed by life itself during the present period of transition when the existing blocs are eroding and new security structures have not yet been created. These tasks are naturally linked with the problem of disarmament and the creation of an all-European security system.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman drew journalists' attention to the fact that all the measures outlined by the conference have been conceived as part of the development of the Helsinki process. They will be implemented as the new all-European security structures are formed. The philosophy behind this approach, Kvitsinskiy pointed out, resides in the fact that by changing itself, the Warsaw Pact will also promote changes within the other alliance—NATO—and serve as a kind of motor for change on an all-European scale. It is no coincidence that a number of steps were outlined at the PCC precisely for the period preceding the preparations for an all-European summit meeting. It is indicative that, when closing the PCC conference, GDR Prime Minister L. de Maiziere pointed out that the "Warsaw Pact has set a good example which will, we hope, be taken up by the other side"—that is, NATO.

The upshot was that the conference adopted a declaration by the Warsaw Pact states. It has been described as a substantive document imbued with a new spirit which clearly expresses the idea that contemporary development in Europe is creating conditions enabling the bloc model of continental security to be overcome. This development, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said, is becoming irreversible and accords with the peoples' desire to live in harmony without an artificial conglomeration of barriers and without ideological enmity. Measures have been outlined to transform the existing alliance into a pact of equal sovereign states. With this in view it has been decided to create a provisional commission of government representatives which is to submit concrete proposals to an extraordinary PCC session by the end of this October. Of particular interest in this connection was the clause in the declaration which confirms the readiness for constructive cooperation with the North Atlantic alliance as such, with its members, and also with neutral and nonaligned states on the continent on a bilateral and multilateral basis in the interests of European stability, disarmament, confidence-building, and affirming the principle of defense sufficiency.

Journalists were told that practically all the conference's participants touched on aspects of German unification; moreover the general conviction was expressed that it must be effected within the context of the all-European process, on the basis of its principles, and with consideration for the security interests of Germany's neighbors and all other states, and that there must be firm guarantees of the inviolability of European borders. Kvitsinskiy pointed out that there was good contact between all the conference participants in their understanding of the aims they have set themselves.

In response to questions he stressed that the conference took place in a friendly, businesslike atmosphere and that it demonstrated that it is necessary to display both resoluteness and caution in transforming the Warsaw Pact and NATO. These processes must be strictly synchronized.

Timing of Changes Set

LD0806163490 Moscow TASS in English 1535 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—Soviet diplomatic circles are focussing on one aspect of the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee (PCC), held in Moscow on Thursday—the readiness of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO) to renew itself.

The increased emphasis on the political and consultative aspect and a review of some obsolete structures in the WTO require an in-depth analysis and assessment of the documents adopted by participants in the PCC meeting, informed sources in the Soviet Foreign Ministry point out.

The suggested time-frame is rather rigid: in order to transform WTO agencies, including military ones, it was decided to set up a provisional commission of authorised government agents. The commission must submit specific proposals to an extraordinary PCC session before the end of October 1990, and PCC will consider them before the end of November. Contrary to speculations in the West about the break-up of the Warsaw Treaty, there was not a single application to withdraw for the WTO, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Kvitsinskiy told a news conference at the close of the PCC meeting.

Speakers pointed out that "the treaty plays its role, that it is essential to refine, transform and adapt it to the changed circumstances and that WTO membership is of political and other benefit to member-states," Kvitsinskiy said.

Kvitsinskiy's opinion was confirmed during President Gorbachev's meetings with the leaders of the Warsaw Treaty countries. The role played by the Warsaw Treaty in current negotiations, including the Vienna talks on conventional arms, illustrates that the socio-economic and political reforms in East European countries are based on realistic estimates of the domestic and international situation, current relationships and the balance of forces on the continent.

The Warsaw Treaty has begun to implement its concept of an all-European security system. WTO members expect that NATO will also contribute to this process and to establishing contacts between the two alliances.

Pact Leaders Comment on Outcome

*PM0806111590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
8 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "Delegations Depart"]

[Text] The delegations from the following Warsaw Pact member states—Bulgaria, the GDR, Poland, Romania, and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic—left Moscow 7 June. They had been taking part in a routine conference of the Political Consultative Committee.

Before departing, President P. Mladenov of Bulgaria answered your TASS correspondent's question by rating the results of the conference as highly positive. He stressed the crucial character of the historical moment in which it had taken place and expressed the hope of a positive response to it from the West.

During a brief conversation with your TASS correspondent, President I. Iliescu of Romania noted that the content of the Moscow talks matched the pace and character of the enormous changes which have now affected the European continent. Together with our partners we are creating new foundations for security in Europe and are overcoming bloc barriers, he said.

At the aircraft steps your, TASS correspondent asked Poland's President Jaruzelski and Prime Minister Mazowiecki to characterize the possible future of the Warsaw Pact from the viewpoint of the conference they had just attended.

We came to the conclusion, W. Jaruzelski said, that the Warsaw Pact is necessary but that its reform as an instrument broadening the sphere of dialogue with the West and implementing bilateral relations is also inevitable.

Prime Minister Mazowiecki noted the importance of the first-hand information on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit received from President Gorbachev.

The eminent guests were seen off at the airport by A.N. Yakovlev and Yu.A. Osipyan, members of the USSR Presidential Council; Army General P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces; and other officials.

Pact Leaders Cited Further

*PM0806212390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Jun 90 First Edition p 6*

[TASS report: "Constructive Basis. Political Consultative Committee Conference Participants' Assessments"]

[Text] 8 Jun—WARSAW: As expected, the work of the Political Consultative Committee conference was successful, President W. Jaruzelski of Poland has said on his return from Moscow. We believe, he went on, in the necessity of the continued existence of the Warsaw Pact although it will have to be radically reformed. Its functions and structures must accord with the spirit of the times. In addition to its traditional function, the Pact is increasingly becoming a political organization and simultaneously, and possibly to a decisive degree, a sphere of East-West dialogue. This is its new and very important function. In the past it has served to divide, now it must unite.

BUCHAREST: The Moscow conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee was the first such conference since the radical transformations in all the East European countries, in the context of the changes which are taking place in Europe as a whole. Therefore the necessity of adapting the Warsaw Pact in line with the changes which are taking place in the present-day world was at the focus of its attention, President I. Iliescu of Romania said here.

The necessity of transforming it from a military alliance into a predominantly political organization which would promote the proceeses taking place on the continent and expand the framework of ensuring security in Europe was discussed. This is, of course, a complex process which presupposes transformations within both alliances, a process which is also connected with the unification of Germany and the transformations in the political life of the continent's states and consequently also with the need to create an integral base on the scale of the whole continent, the Romanian leader said further. This presupposes the creation of a new climate in the relations between all European states.

PRAGUE: The Warsaw Pact requires radical transformation because, in its present shape, it is a legacy of Stalinism when the armies of East Europe were essentially subordinated to the Soviet Army, President V. Havel of Czechoslovakia, has said. This structure, he went on, is a reflection of the past and change is long overdue. The Warsaw Pact has a specific role to play during the transitional period, but this role must have a completely new basis. We have believed from the very beginning that there is no sense in withdrawing from the Warsaw Pact. By withdrawing from this pact we would lose all influence on its future fate. This kind of withdrawal would essentially be an illusion of real neutrality. We believe that Czechoslovakia can become neutral only if the whole of Europe becomes neutral. Therefore when we were asked to take part in the Moscow conference we agreed immediately, although the timing was not very convenient for us.

BUDAPEST: We can count on a positive assessment by the country's parliament of the Hungarian delegation's work in Moscow because its stance was correct and realistic, Prime Minister J. Antall of Hungary has declared. We regard as essential a review of the character and functions of the Warsaw Pact.

Jaruzelski, Antall Interviewed

PM0906171790 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 9 Jun 90 p 1

[Interview with Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski and Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall by unidentified RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent under "Interview For This Edition" rubric; place, date not specified: "What Sort of Pact?"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski and Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall, who are taking part in the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference, answered our correspondent's questions.

[Correspondent] What is your view of the current Political Consultative Committee conference in the context of the future of the Warsaw Pact?

[Jaruzelski] It was a very important meeting. I have been taking part in conferences of this kind for a very long time. In varying roles moreover. The present discussion was of a different character. Europe has changed, the part of Europe where we live has changed, and the people who were present in the conference hall have also changed. Most of them are new people. I admit I thought that we would have more difficulties in finding a common language on fundamental issues. Of course, differing views did emerge on certain specific problems related to the structure and the military aspect of the pact. But the main thing is that the realization that it is advisable at this time to preserve and continue the work of the Warsaw Pact won through. This will, of course, be in a new formula that makes provision for its functional and structural reconstruction. Our defensive alliance—like NATO, moreover—has ceased to be an instrument of force and is becoming an instrument of dialogue. We must seek new ways to enrich this dialogue and utilize the opportunities provided by collective cooperation in order to make contacts with the countries of the West.

[Antall] As for the future of the Warsaw Pact, it will, obviously, mean its complete transformation even within the transitional period. The question of how long the Warsaw Pact will exist and whether it will be replaced by an all-European security system is a special one. Our delegation submitted a number of proposals revising the nature, functions, and operation of the Warsaw Pact. We believe that its military organization has already lost its significance. The correlation of forces in Europe has changed. There is no threat at all to anyone from any side.

As for Hungary, its position is specific. We do not even border on a single NATO country. That is why we have stated the following at the level of our government program and also of the decision adopted by the Hungarian State Assembly: If the Warsaw Pact remains, we intend to leave it. But we will not do this by making some unilateral proclamation, but by means of talks.

[Correspondent] How do you see the process of German unification?

[Jaruzelski] This is a key question for Poland, which is hardly surprising. We are interested in ensuring that German unification is arranged within the process of European unification and that it at least does not go beyond the framework of this process. That is the first thing. Second, we must hope that a united Germany will be a firmly democratic, peace-loving state with the minimum possible armaments ceiling. A state that will take its neighbors' opinion into consideration and understand their anxiety. The main issue here is to remove the border problem as quickly as possible.

[Antall] Naturally, we are in favor of a united Germany. Every people has the right to self-determination, including the German people. A united Germany can, of course, be created within the framework of the two German states' existing borders.

It is impossible to imagine security in Europe without German unity. This unity is most feasible within the framework of European unity. We believe the U.S. military presence in Europe is a stabilizing factor.

German democracy has proved its right to exist. I do not know another more acceptable example of democracy to date than that which has been accomplished in the FRG. That is, I see no threat of any other dangers of a political nature arising in Germany.

One cannot, of course, help but consider the other side of the coin. The peoples have the emotional memory of the past. They are endeavoring to obtain as many guarantees as possible. After two world wars, this endeavor is completely understandable.

Jaruzelski, Falin Comment on Pact

AU0706210890 Vienna Television Service in German 2000 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Report by Raimund Loew from Moscow, including interview with Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski and Valentin Falin of the CPSU Central Committee—recorded]

[Text] At today's meeting, the Eastern alliance has broken with many traditions. The Warsaw Pact would like to transform itself from a military bloc to a primarily political association. Officials even answer the most impertinent questions by Western journalists in this connection.

[Loew] It has been said that this decision is more or less the burial of the Warsaw Pact. What do you think?

[Jaruzelski] Well, just look at us. We do not look like mourners. We are in a good mood. I believe that we are far away from a burial. This would be much too early. The Warsaw Pact may even play an important role in the future—in a different way and with different methods than in the past. Its basic role must be reconsidered, and its internal structures must be changed. If this is carried out successfully, the Warsaw Pact may turn into an important instrument to establish closer ties between the East and West.

[Loew] Do you think that it will continue to exist for a long time?

[Jaruzelski] One must see this in connection with the entire situation. As long as there is no complete and comprehensive security system in Europe, we must work on the basis of the old structures. The Warsaw Pact must now contribute to eliminating the differences and to bringing the continent closer to such a general security system.

[Loew] What seemed a grotesque joke even yesterday is the subject of serious discussion today—namely that the Soviet Union might also apply for membership in NATO.

[Falin] This proposal was already submitted in 1954. The proposal was rejected at the time by the Western states.

[Loew] Do you think the proposal might be repeated?

[Falin] If the preconditions for the association of the members of the Warsaw Pact and also of the members of NATO and for membership in NATO and in the Warsaw Pact exist, why not?

[Loew] Do you think that the Warsaw Pact as it exists today has a great future?

[Falin] Not in the way it exists today. However, the same applies to NATO in its present form.

Hungarian Spokesman Comments

LD0706174790 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1600 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] The Warsaw Pact's summit meeting has concluded in Moscow with the issuing of a joint communique. Hungarian Government spokesman Balazs Laszlo spoke to our correspondent Gabor Izbeki about the results.

[Begin recording] [Laszlo] I believe that this Moscow session of the Warsaw Pact's member states concluded with a considerable Hungarian success. Already our premier, Jozsef Antall, who was chairing during the first half of the session, managed to get the participants to accept, when approving the agenda, that as the second point it should not be the radical reforming—the transformation of the Warsaw Pact's military organization—but rather its review which should be discussed. And this was the Hungarian objective.

As regards the statement, and thus the summary of the session's results, the essence from the Hungarian viewpoint is in the fourth and the sixth point. In these two points, of key importance there was success in asserting the Hungarian objectives, the Hungarian viewpoints.

They contain the essential sentences, thus: The states represented at the session will actively take part in this dynamic process—that is, in the transformation of Europe—and for this reason they consider a review of the character and functions of the Warsaw Pact to be indispensable. Their conviction is that only in this case will the Warsaw Pact be suitable in the transition period for performing the new, timely tasks related to disarmament, the creation of an all-European security system.

The second essential circumstance in the sixth point is that in this new situation the Warsaw Pact states will begin work on reviewing the pact's character, functions, and activity. And for this purpose, a provisional committee of government representatives was set up which by the end of October this year will submit to the Political Consultative Committee its concrete proposals pertaining to this. These proposals will be examined by the Political Consultative Committee by the end of November.

I should like to add to this that also figuring in the minutes which were not made public is that the organization will hold an extraordinary session of the Political Consultative Committee in Budapest sometime in

November and there, on the basis of the committee's report and recommendations, the measures will be determined by means of which the above-signalled review and—in practical terms and according to our objectives, hopes—the winding up and dismantling of the military organization of the Warsaw Pact will begin. According to my information these same minutes also provide that in the event of agreement, these measures, the implementation thereof, will begin as from the beginning of the year, 1 January.

[Izbeki] Can this be assessed in such a way as to claim that in effect the Hungarian delegation has completed all its tasks at this political consultative committee session?

[Laszlo] Yes, and what's more without a break, without confrontation and collisions.

[Izbeki] Then what is the explanation for the fact that at the session—with the exception of the Hungarian delegation—still no one dealt in a concrete fashion with these plans?

[Laszlo] Various, partly similar but much more hesitant and incoherent proposals have been made; by the Czechoslovak president and the GDR prime minister. But it was only the Hungarian delegation which put its proposals in such a rational, comprehensive, inter-relating system.

[Izbeki] Then, in the end, the closing communique reflects the fact that really everybody was expecting that something like this should happen because—we must not be too modest—it was not thanks to the aggressiveness of the Hungarians to get such a decision but because the situation matured for the birth of such a decision.

[Laszlo] The situation did mature for a decision but of course the game has not been played out yet. And it has also come to light at this session that considering the aims and direction of the transformation of the Warsaw Pact and its adjustment to the spirit of the times, significant differences also exist between the member states.

Essentially, it was the Hungarian delegation alone which formulated the position that time had passed over the military organization of the Warsaw Pact and the most rational thing would be to gradually abolish the lot. The others, the rest of the member states, in general took the position that the Pact, after thorough reform, could still fulfill a positive—what's more, a constructive—role in bringing the two sides of Europe closer and in shaping a new, comprehensive European security system.

[Izbeki] Does the adoption of the Hungarian proposal mean that the Soviets completely agree with it?

[Laszlo] The acceptance of the Hungarian proposal roughly means that we could try to carry out our aims with the help of a suitably worked out channel, institution. As to whether in the final analysis it will succeed in this way, whether it will materialize in this way can only be shown by the coming months. [end recording]

Antall Comments on Talks

LD1006203390 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 10 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Kuklin]

[Text] Budapest, June 10 TASS—The Moscow meeting of the Warsaw Treaty states Political Consultative Committee is regarded as an important political event in Hungary. Asked about the first visit of the new Hungarian leadership to Moscow, Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall told a news conference in Budapest that he was impressed by his talks with Mikhail Gorbachev, especially by the confidence and optimism of the Soviet leader which prove the strength of his positions and great determination to pursue his political course. "These qualities of a political leader deserve great respect," Antall said.

The Hungarian prime minister said that his talks with Gorbachev had not been of a personal nature that would create an opportunity for a profound exchange of views and the establishment of personal contacts. "However, I had an opportunity to talk to the Soviet leader and watch his reaction. I can claim that Gorbachev is a politician of unique abilities, committed to his ideas and firmly confident in the success of his Perestroyka policy, despite the difficult circumstances. The Soviet leader conducted the talks confidently, resolutely and with optimism for the future," Antall went on to say.

"Another characteristic feature of the Moscow talks was an open analysis of perestroyka and the assessment of difficulties existing in the Soviet Union."

"I also felt the same sincerity and openness during the talks with my Soviet counterpart Nikolay Ryzhkov and Soviet military officials," Antall emphasised.

Comparison on Pact Meeting Ends

LD0706204190

Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 7 June carries a similar report on the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee meeting in Moscow on 7 June. This version has been compared with the TASS English version published in the 8 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 12, and found to be identical except for the following:

Page 12, column one, first paragraph, only sentence reads: [Text] Moscow June 7 TASS—The Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee held its meeting in Moscow today.

The conference was attended by the following:

From the People's Republic of Bulgaria [PRB]: Petur Mladenov, PRB president and head of the delegation; Andrey Lukanov, PRB Council of Ministers chairman; Dobri Dzhurov, PRB minister of National Defense; and Boyko Dimitrov, PRB foreign minister.

From the Republic of Hungary: Jozsef Antall, Republic of Hungary prime minister and head of the delegation; Arpad Goncz, Republic of Hungary interim president; Lajos Fur, Republic of Hungary minister of defense; Ferenc Somogyi, Republic of Hungary Foreign Ministry state secretary; and Sandor Gyorke, Republic of Hungary ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR.

From the GDR: Lothar de Maiziere, GDR prime minister and head of delegation; Sabine Bergmann-Pohl, GDR Volkskammer president; Markus Meckel, GDR foreign minister; and Rainer Eppelmann, GDR minister of disarmament and defense.

From the Republic of Poland: Wojciech Jaruzelski, Republic of Poland president and head of delegation; Tadeusz Mazowiecki, Republic of Poland Council of Ministers chairman; Krzysztof Skubiszewski, Republic of Poland foreign minister; and Florian Siwicki, Republic of Poland defense minister.

From Romania; Ion Iliescu, Romanian president of and head of delegation; Petre Roman, Romanian prime minister; Victor Stanculescu, Romanian minister of national defense; Romulus Neagu, Romanian deputy minister of foreign affairs; and Vasile Sandru, Romanian ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR.

From the USSR: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR president and head of delegation; Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman; Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister; Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, USSR Presidential Council member; and Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, USSR minister of defense.

From the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic: Vaclav Havel, CSFR president and head of delegation; Marian Calfa, CSFR Government premier; Jiri Dienstbier, CSFR Government deputy premier and CSFR foreign minister; Miroslav Vacek, CSFR minister of national defense.

I.P. Aboimov, Political Consultative Committee secretary general, and Army General P.G. Lushev, Warsaw Pact member states Joint Armed Forces commander in chief, also took part in the conference.

The meeting focused on prospects for the common European process, fostering new structures of security and the strengthening of stability in Europe. (adding paragraphs)

TASS Reports on Two-Plus-Four Talks

LD0906182190 Moscow TASS in English 1751 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Berlin June 9 TASS—The second meeting of representatives of the foreign ministry leadership from the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as the Soviet Union, the United States, France and the United Kingdom, opened here today.

The meeting is held within the framework of the Two-Plus-Four negotiations on German unification.

Representatives of six countries are expected to discuss four cycles of problems, as agreed at the first meeting of the foreign ministers in early May. They relate to border issues, military-political issues taking into account the search for suitable security structures in Europe, and problems relating to Berlin, as well as the international legal settlement and the abolition of rights and responsibilities of the four victorious powers.

No official confirmation of the agenda has been forthcoming as participants agreed to keep the process of negotiations confidential.

The present meeting of experts is due to prepare the forthcoming next round of talks at the ministerial level, scheduled for June 22 in Berlin.

The decision on holding the Two-Plus-Four negotiations was made in Ottawa in the middle of February to work out external aspects of German unification, including security for neighboring countries.

Reportage on Meeting of NATO Foreign Ministers

Communique Stresses Security

LD0806223690 Moscow TASS in English 2216 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Levchenko]

[Text] Turnberry, Scotland June 9 TASS—"We, the foreign ministers of the alliance, express our determination to seize the historic opportunities resulting from the profound changes in Europe to help build a new peaceful order in Europe, based on freedom, justice and democracy. In this spirit, we extend to the Soviet Union and to all other European countries the hand of friendship and cooperation," says a message from Turnberry, the final press communique of the two-day ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council.

The message stresses that true and enduring security in Europe will be best assured through mutual acknowledgement and understanding of the legitimate security interests of all states. "We are ready to contribute actively to building confidence and closer relations between all European countries, including the members of the two alliances. We welcome the statement issued by the members of the Warsaw Treaty organisation in Moscow on 7th June. We are encouraged by the positive spirit conveyed in this declaration and in particular by the readiness on the part of the countries issuing it for constructive cooperation," the message says.

The participants in the session, whose views are expected to form the basis for political decisions concerning NATO's role and strategy due to be made at a forthcoming summit meeting of NATO countries' heads of states and governments in London, believe that the CSCE process, which will become even more important as an instrument for cooperation and security in Europe, should be strengthened and given effective institutional form. They stressed their commitment to work for a rapid and successful conclusion of the Vienna negotiations on conventional forces. "The arms control process must be vigorously pursued," the message notes.

The foreign ministers welcomed the progress attained at the U.S.-Soviet summit in Washington, in particular the agreement on major outstanding issues governing a strategic arms reduction treaty. They expressed hope that the U.S.-Soviet agreement on reducing chemical weapons stockpiles will provide great impetus towards the earliest possible conclusion of the convention for an effectively verifiable, global and comprehensive ban on chemical weapons.

It was pointed out at the meeting that the political and economic reforms underway in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are of "crucial importance." "The continued progress of these states towards becoming democratic and economically prosperous partners cooperating with us will be an important element in the future security and stability of Europe. We are prepared to support their efforts to integrate their economies more closely into the world economy and to widen and deepen the scope of our cooperation with them as they progress, thus contributing to the success of their reform programmes," the communique stresses.

At the same time, the final document pointed out that the need to maintain common defence remained vital. "For the foreseeable future, the prevention of war will continue to require an appropriate mix of survivable and effective conventional and nuclear forces, at the lowest levels consistent with our security needs." Changes in the USSR and East European countries "call into question neither the necessity for maintaining the alliance nor the permanence of its fundamental features. We will keep our alliance dynamic and cohesive and will continue to foster a solid and fruitful transatlantic relationship between North America and an increasingly united Europe."

So far as Germany's reunification is concerned, participants in the meeting expressed their conviction that "German unification is a major contribution to stability in Europe." "We believe that European stability, as well as the wishes of the German people, requires that a unified Germany be a full member of this alliance.

including its integrated military structure...We seek no unilateral advantage from German unity and are prepared to demonstrate this, taking into account legitimate Soviet security interests. A free and democratic Germany will be an essential element of a peaceful order in Europe in which no state need harbour fears for its security against its neighbours."

The communique expressed hope that "the problems accompanying the difficult internal transition of the Soviet Union be solved in a constructive manner and to the satisfaction of all concerned." Touching upon the situation in Lithuania, participants in the meeting urged all parties to show flexibility and enter into true dialogue to reach an early solution.

IZVESTIYA Views Meeting

PM0806183590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Krivopalov: "NATO Faced With a Choice"]

[Text] London—The NATO countries' foreign ministers have gathered in Turnberry, Scotland. Their meeting is expected to last two days. There was a cold downpour for the opening of the conference in this small corner of Scotland, which allowed some London journalists to use a well-worn image.

The radical changes in contemporary political life inspire hopes of a change of direction by the North Atlantic bloc. Calls for this are coming from all sides, including from inside the NATO camp itself. Many Europeans, if not the overwhelming majority of them, expect statements and steps that will shake up the old image of cold Atlantic winds in relation to NATO.

A political observer for THE TIMES wrote on the day the foreign ministers' meeting opened: "The lexicon of the cold war has no place in these debates. Nevertheless, NATO is still armed with slogans which have served so well in the past: 'forward basing,' 'flexible response,' and 'the necessary combination of conventional and nuclear forces.'"

The journalist from THE TIMES believes that there needs to be a total rethinking of NATO strategy in central Europe. Such "sacred cows" as the doctrine of "flexible response" and "forward basing" will have to be abandoned. Facts are facts: The voices of those who believe that NATO must become not so much a military organization as a political organization are gathering momentum in all the West European capitals.

Before leaving Copenhagen for the meeting with his North Atlantic partners, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker said: We have no intention of reducing the vitally important role played by this bloc. "We believe," he stressed, "that NATO will remain a buttress of military security and political activity in the new Europe." However, the U.S. secretary of state is also now talking about creating organizational structures for the CSCE.

One thing is evidently beyond doubt: The ministers assembled in Turnberry are going to devote particularly great attention to the problem of a united Germany's possible incorporation into NATO. There are indications that a package of proposals has been prepared that is intended to "allay the fears" of the Soviet Union. These measures include consent to keep Soviet troops in East Germany for a transitional period and rejection of the stationing of NATO forces in East Germany.

We must now reach agreement on other security structures, D. Healey, former Labor minister, said, addressing the House of Commons—he had a direct bearing, incidentally, on the emergence of NATO's "rapid response" formula. The new system, the British parliamentarian stressed, "could be based, as the Russians suggest, on the CSCE."

The small town of Turnberry, where the NATO foreign ministers are gathered, is situated in the county of Ayrshire. This is the birthplace of Robert Burns, the famed Scottish poet who once dreamed that fraternity rather than enmity will reign throughout the world. Several kilometers from Turnberry is a small village called Moscow—the Soviet capital's namesake. A small stream called the Volga flows through it.

More Cooperation Predicted

PM0906223590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Special correspondents A. Lyutyy and V. Peresada dispatch: "Time of Change. NATO Council Session"]

[Text] Turnberry (Scotland), 8 Jun—"We the alliance's foreign ministers express our determination to avail ourselves of the historic opportunities stemming from the profound changes in Europe in order to help build a new world order on the continent founded on freedom, justice, and democracy. In this spirit we extend to the Soviet Union and all other European countries the hand of friendship and cooperation."

These are the opening words of the final communique adopted by the 16 NATO member countries' foreign ministers at their meeting in the Scottish hamlet of Turnberry.

This meeting, which was officially called a NATO Council session, was the last stage before a conference of alliance leaders to be held in London in July. Its task was to prepare the practical decisions that will be announced at this conference. What was agreed at Turnberry?

First, the meeting's participants agreed that the all-European process, whose role should be strengthened, will continue to be a highly important instrument for security and cooperation. In this connection they particularly pointed out the need to convene a CSCE summit conference this year and create permanent institutions for the all-European process in the future.

Second, it is planned to maintain the momentum in the disarmament process both on the European Continent and on a world scale. In particular, it is planned to begin talks on short-range nuclear missiles after a conventional arms agreement is signed. The session welcomed the progress made on the question of strategic offensive arms cuts at the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The ministers expressed willingness to help the U.S.-USSR accords on chemical weapons lead to a complete ban on these weapons.

The problem of German unification received special attention, along with the task of maintaining stability in Europe. Confirming the NATO line of incorporating a united Germany within the alliance, the session's participants stated at the same time the need to safeguard the Soviet Union's legitimate security interests. A number of concrete proposals were elaborated on this score, and they will be made public in London.

The discussion of the possibility of relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact represented a quite new element in meetings of this kind. It has come to our knowledge that this question provoked a debate. However, a constructive line in favor of "broadening and deepening political contacts at all levels" can nonetheless be detected in the final communique.

Of course, many aspects of NATO's political and military strategy remain unchanged as yet. For instance, a future security structure in Europe is allocated merely a parallel role, alongside the retention of NATO as the "mainstay of the new European order." It is also intended to keep U.S. nuclear and conventional forces on the continent and strengthen Atlantic solidarity.

All the same, despite this, the course of moving away from confrontation toward cooperation in relations with the East emerged at Turnberry as never before.

'Constructive Line' Noted

LD1006174590 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Now an item about the results of another major conference that was held a few days ago in Scotland, in Turnberry. This was a session of the NATO Council at foreign minister level.

The final communique of the Turnberry conference said that the NATO ministers welcome the statement of the member nations of the Warsaw Pact, made in Moscow on 7 June. The statement is infused with a positive spirit and a well-expressed readiness of the countries that signed it for constructive cooperation. The NATO foreign ministers voice their resolve to make use of the historical possibilities emanating from the deep changes in Europe so as to help with building a new peaceful order on the continent, based on freedom, justice and democracy. In the NATO Council session's communique the foreign ministers extended a hand of friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union and all other European countries. A constructive line was announced also in favor of broader and deeper political contacts with the Warsaw Treaty countries.

At the same time many aspects of the military as well as political strategy of NATO remained unchanged so far. The NATO foreign ministers confirmed, for instance, that a united Germany should be part of NATO. And another point, the future security structure of Europe is given only a parallel role with the NATO remaining as the mainstay of the new European order. And yet despite this, at the Turnberry conference a line came to the fore for a transition in relations with the East from confrontation to cooperation.

Roundtable Program Views Future of NATO, Pact

LD1006154790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1130 GMT on 10 June carries its 30-minute "International Observers Roundtable" program, hosted by Nikolay Agayants, with current affairs writers Vitaliy Kobysh and Yuriy Kornilov.

Agayants begins by quoting from the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee declaration adopted in Moscow this week. Kornilov reads out excerpts from past NATO and Warsaw Pact documents to illustrate how the spirit of confrontation has receded. Agayants mentions that the committee set up a commission to draw up Pact reform proposals by the autumn. The three participants hope the Vienna conventional arms talks will reach a successful conclusion.

Kobysh then says: "Colleagues, we have leaped into this conversation so quickly that I think we forgot to mention one very important point which caused a world sensation: the very fact that this conference took place. After all, the Western press and indeed many Western politicians had virtually written off the Warsaw Pact Organization, they thought it simply does not exist any more after all that has happened in East Europe. And the fact that the top representatives of those states came to Moscow, sat down at a table, and in the course of one day found a common language on the most complex problems of today and on European problems..."

Agayants interrupts: "But at this point I would like to remind you that at the Moscow conference of the Political Consultative Committee our president, Gorbachev, also briefed the leaders of the allied states on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit held at the end of May and beginning of June. The accords and agreements reached in Washington undoubtedly introduce yet another new element in Soviet-U.S. relations—I mean the need for a far higher level of mutual trust than has existed up until now. This trust will determine the possibility of implementing a number of components of the future treaty on limitation and cuts in strategic offensive arms, in particular the highly complex issues of verification, the bilateral agreement on the destruction of chemical weapons stocks, and Soviet-U.S. trade agreements. This trust has been reinforced thanks to the personal mutual understanding and contact between the leaders of the two powers. I think we have every reason to dwell in greater detail on these aspects."

Kornilov says many agreements were signed in Washington; he quotes approval from De Maiziere, Kohl, Vranitzky, Andreotti, and Van den Broek. Most of the mass media reacted positively, HUMANITE cited. THE WASHINGTON POST wrote, however, that the summit gave Gorbachev little to help solve his domestic problems; THE NEW YORK TIMES stated that Soviet people are more interested in internal problems than foreign policy successes nowadays. Kornilov says that international cooperation and domestic improvements are interlinked; he cites the conversion of military industry as an example. We can learn from Western experience of conversion, he says, and use the resources thus saved for social provisions.

Kornilov says: "Fine, but as to the question of what our people are expecting, or what the disarmament talks will actually do to help solve our problems, this is something one could look into in a more concrete vein. So what will it actually mean for our country if Moscow and Washington really do agree—and today, following the summit, the world believes this will happen—on a 50 percent cut in strategic offensive weapons? At the moment we have around 2,500 ballistic missile launchers and heavy bombers. These will be cut to no more than 1,600 as will be the case in the United States too. There are approximately 10,000 nuclear warheads on our strategic carriers at the moment; they will be cut to no more than 6,000, as in the United States as well.

"But this does not only mean a drastic reduction in the level of military rivalry, though this is of course the most important thing. It also means a drastic cut in production of that type of weapon and a reduction in expenditure on maintaining that weaponry in combat readiness, and the possibility of cuts in the armed forces themselves. And all the resources thereby freed—and I think we are talking in billions rather than millions here—can be used for civilian purposes and improving people's lives."

Kobysh then says the United States also has social problems and needs these resources. Agayants expands on the pernicious effects on the arms race and the financial benefits to be gained from ceasing it. Western press comment is cited on importance of the nuclear test protocol signed in Washington. Stockholm Peace Research Institute figures are quoted on the frequency of nuclear tests: 27 last year, 18 of them by the United States and USSR. This confirms the need to further restrict tests and consign them to the history books.

Agayants says: "Incidentally, coming back to the summit meeting between the Soviet and U.S. Presidents, we ought to point out, I think, that the meeting was not quite so straightforward or smooth. Some very serious issues arose, problems that were discussed but on which no accords were actually reached. In particular, the problem of the future unification of Germany. Washington's position—and I think Bush stressed this clearly enough during the joint press conference—is based on the future Germany being a member of NATO. We are categorically opposed to such a decision. But perhaps you could tell us in detail what you think of this problem, Vitaliy Ivanovich?"

Kobysh replies: "This is a tough problem because what we have is quite a picturesque situation in which one state belongs to two formerly confronting military blocs and yet must somehow live and exist. It is a most insane situation and something that cannot, of course, happen. So all kinds of options have emerged: the French option of neutralizing Germany, but not everyone likes it. I'm afraid that some people, including perhaps the French and the British above all, don't like it because they are in fact afraid of Germany and proceed from the view of NATO as a mechanism for controlling Germany and keeping it on a leash. But that's my own conjecture, actually. Perhaps the French and the British really think differently, but I suspect that they do not want Germany to leave NATO for that reason above all and that they will never agree, of course, to Germany obtaining nuclear weapons while being part of NATO."

Agayants then asks: "Vitaliy Ivanovich, during the joint press conference we mentioned by Gorbachev and the U.S. President, George Bush bluntly said the following. 'I'm not sure we have narrowed the gap between us. I think I understand President Gorbachev's position, but I have had every opportunity to explain why I think a united Germany within the framework of NATO would play a stabilizing role, an important role for ensuring stability in Europe. But I cannot say that we have narrowed the gap.' What interests me is that, well, on a hypothetical level, perhaps Bush is right? Perhaps nothing terrible would happen if the future of united Germany were part of NATO?"

Kornilov replies: "That's another rather imaginary situation. I think there would be nothing terrible about Germany being in NATO if NATO were to change from a military bloc into a purely political organization."

Agayants goes on: "In other words, the demands for changes to to the structure of NATO, just like the demands being heard regarding the Warsaw Pact, are now already conscious and real."

Kobysh responds: "Yes, and the big question now is whether our example, the example set by the Warsaw Pact in setting out to turn into a political organization, to turn into an organization that will deal with economic cooperation, environmental issues, culture and so on, whether this example will be taken up by NATO. If that were to happen, things would be quite different; we could then talk."

Kornilov says: "In that case the development of Europe—which is in fact what we are already proposing—would then take the path of gradual or less gradual disappearance of the two blocs and their replacement by some kind of all-European structures with the task of ensuring security for everyone, equal security in the fight against hunger, against economic, environmental and social problems—in other words, the entire political spectrum in Europe. After all this constantly changing, and with this kind of prospect Germany could belong to some kind of structure which is no longer confrontational but takes in the whole of Europe."

The participants agree that such a structure is already taking shape; first of all, in what the European peoples along with the United States and Canada achieved in Helsinki. The Helsinki CSCE agreements provide a basis for precisely this kind of cooperation. Agayants says: "So we would be absolutely correct in saying that the continuation of the Helsinki process and endeavours to create an all-European home and to transform the two military blocs into political organizations after long decades of confrontation may, in the end, lead to a serious and correct solution of this still controversial and acute problem."

Kornilov responds: "I think that we would be realistic, and in this context incidentally, the option that we once put forward not so long ago—the option of German neutrality—about which for some reason little is now being written... Vitaliy Ivanovich is right in saying that not everyone is happy with that option, but should it now be seen as quite so unacceptable and rejected as an idea? I would think that in the context of a future Europe with all-European structures dealing with all-European affairs, a neutral Germany would fit in perfectly well. I don't see anything unfeasible, unlikely, or contrary to anyone's interests in this."

Agayants expresses the hope that the process of seeking some kind of consensus will continue. "I think we shall meet here in our studio around this table on more than one occasion and discuss the acute problems facing the countries of Europe and the whole world," he says and concludes with a quotation from THE NEW YORK TIMES on the substantial results of the Washington summit and the continuing U.S.-Soviet dialogue.

Reportage on Current Events Regarding CSCE

Helsinki Process Analyzed

LD0806103190 Moscow TASS in English 0754 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko]

[Text] Washington June 8 TASS—The principles inherent in the Final Act of the Conference on Security in Europe (CSCE) have never been as close to implementation as now, according to the 28th regular half-yearly study prepared by the U.S. State Department.

The study evaluates the implementation of the Helsinki accords by East European countries and considers in detail problems connected with European security and cooperation in the economy, science and technology, and human rights.

The report also analyses the events that took place from October 1, 1989, to March 31 1990.

As a result of the considerable changes that have taken place in the world arena, CSCE countries have reached an important stage: for the first time the principles, on which the Helsinki process is based, have been recognised by all CSCE countries as valuable, if not yet fully implemented, the study points out.

European countries, the United States and Canada face the task of attaining the long-standing goal: full observation of the obligations arising from the Helsinki Final Act.

A new chapter is now beginning in the CSCE process: to promote peaceful, democratic changes, to consolidate the positive changes that took place, to ease tension and to strengthen common interests and cooperation between all CSCE countries, the survey points out.

In terms of measures being taken by the Soviet Union to implement the provisions of the Helsinki Final Act, the U.S. State Department notes [the] following positive steps: a persistently high level of Jewish emigration, the holding of open and free elections in the Baltic republics, the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, and Moldavia.

Despite the Soviet leadership's commitment to building a state based on the rule of law, the drafting of new laws that would bring the Soviet legal theory into line with international standards in the field of civil rights has been delayed, the survey observes. Over the period under review, no law on the press, courts, public organisations, freedom of conscience and emigration were adopted in the Soviet Union, the document stated.

Reviewing the fulfilment of obligations at the international level, the authors of the survey pointed out that the Soviet Union continues to implement its obligations within the framework of comprehensive confidence- and security-building measures, as defined in the Stockholm document.

It is specifically pointed out that the Soviet Union is persistently working for broader international cooperation in the fight against terrorism.

In terms of citizen diplomacy, the Soviet Union continues to show considerable liberalisation in matters concerning the freedom to travel abroad and contacts with people of other countries.

Analysing the dissemination of information in the Soviet Union, the authors of the survey note that striving of news organisations in the USSR for greater openness and more rapid and effective access to sources of information.

Bilateral cultural relations and contacts in education and exchanges are being maintained at a high level, the document says. Cooperation on the part of the Soviet Union in the economy, science, technology, and ecology continued to improve, although it is not always consistent.

Over the period under review, the Soviet Union on the whole continued to implement the Helsinki, Madrid and Vienna accords. However, the Soviet Union still has much work to do, U.S. State Department experts believe.

Progress of Talks Noted

LD0806172290 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna June 8 TASS—To constantly bear in mind the broad European context, to try and march ahead not only in line with the developments but seek to anticipate events—is one of the central tasks of the present phase of talks on confidence-building and security measures in Europe. This idea recurred in many speeches at the today's plenary meeting of the forum attended by 33 European countries, the United States and Canada.

The forthcoming European summit later this year is expected to play the key role in the accomplishment of this task. The preparations for the summit have entered the active phase since the foreign ministers of the CSCE member-countries in Copenhagen decided to set up the preparatory committee for the summit.

Some of the CSCE member-countries have already come out with various ideas and proposals concerning a range of issues they believe should be included in the agenda of the meeting of the heads of states and governments of the 35 nations. All these ideas and proposals are based on the recognition of the need to institutionalize the European process.

German unification is one of the factors determining the urgency of creating Europe's new continental structures. This process gives rise to numerous complicated problems relating to its external aspects. According to the Soviet delegation, a solution to these problems can be found without detriment to anyone's interests if German unification proceeds in conjunction with the creation of new structures compatible with the emerging European unity.

However, the need to create such structures is only partially related to German unification. This large-scale drive has another, more significant aim—to ensure stability and predictability of the European situation and to avert another rift in Europe.

"The CSCE member-countries have a solid base for moving in that direction," Soviet delegation head Oleg Grinevskiy told TASS. "It is the Helsinki Final Act and agreements, rules and procedures connected with it.

"Learning on the rich experience amassed through cooperation within the Helsinki process, these countries are capable of coping with large-scale tasks and creating a new European structure which will counteract forces working to undermine the newly-emerging European unity. The task now is to reach mutual understanding, on the basis of taking into account all valuable ideas, concerning the form and contents of new European structures and get to the European summit with coordinated specific proposals on this score."

It is necessary to act without wasting time, for there exists the risk of falling behind the event and coming face to face with problems which will be much harder to resolve," he said.

Reshetov Addresses Conference

LD0806112690 Moscow TASS in English 1108 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Kiselev and Taras Lariokhin]

[Text] Copenhagen June 8 TASS—Head of the Soviet delegation Yu. Reshetov addressed the second meeting of the human rights conference of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) on Thursday at the Bela Centret exhibition complex in the Danish capital. He spoke in detail about the state of Soviet human rights and measures taken in the USSR to form a rule-of-law state.

A number of important steps stemming from transformations in the Soviet Union have been taken since the Vienna meeting of CSCE member-countries and the human rights conference in Paris.

Much attention has been given to building a rule-of-law state. Sixty-seven important legislative acts have already been adopted. Most of them are directly related to human rights.

"The implementation of laws on property, land, leasing and cooperatives will bring us closer to the ideal of a person who is economically free," the head of the Soviet delegation said. "In the political area, we are abandoning a one-party system and actually passing over to pluralism. There are positive changes also in the legal area."

Reshetov emphasised the development of inter-ethnic relations is prioritised by the multi-ethnic Soviet state. The Supreme Soviet has adopted a number of new laws, each of which relates to a definite form of inter-ethnic relations.

This approach makes it possible to specify legal guarantees for national development and for the political, economic, social and cultural rights of national minorities. Procedure for exit from and entry to the Soviet Union is being decided.

Reshetov said that as a result of the democratisation of Soviet society and radical reforms in Soviet criminal legislation, no one in the Soviet Union is in detention because of his political convictions. Considerable changes are taking place in Soviet psychiatry.

Reshetov said these facts and legislative actions show that the Vienna accords are actually being implemented in the Soviet Union. This process is taking place alongside the considerably heightened civil activity of Soviet people and the beginning of a new stage of democratisation in the USSR.

Moiseyev Reaffirms Pledge To Finish Arms Talks

LD0906134490 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Is Moscow holding up progress at the Vienna talks on conventional armaments in Europe? Many accusations are hurled at the Soviet Union in the West. Here are the views of the chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, Army General Mikhail Moiseyev.

[Moiseyev, in Russian with superimposed English translation] The Warsaw Treaty countries, including the Soviet Union, are far from going to somehow hold up or wreck the Vienna talks. We have a vested interest in their progress. What the press writes isn't always true or accurate. Indeed, some Warsaw Treaty countries share a degree of uncertainty, and it was said for one at the meeting of the chiefs of the general staffs held in Moscow on the first and second of this month. We have some coordinated stipulations fixed in an appropriate document covering every issue negotiated on how much each country within the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO should contribute to elimination of armaments and troops reduction.

Today, in view of what is happening in Europe, some countries would like to back down on their treaty commitments and to retain much more combat vehicles and other armaments than was stipulated initially. I mean the German Democratic Republic. Its representatives have voiced such an idea. A considerable part of the GDR contribution to eliminating combat vehicles and other armaments in case the GDR becomes part of NATO after Germany is united must be distributed among the other Warsaw Treaty countries. As you may realize this is a tough issue, but I think we'll find the right solution.

We shall remain loyal to our pledge to complete the Vienna talks as early as this year.

Cocom Partially Eases Export Restrictions

LD0906030190 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Restrictions on high technology exports to East European countries and the USSR will be softened. Such is the result of a two-day conference held in Paris by members of the coordinating committee for control over exports to the socialist countries, Cocom. The committee was founded in 1949 for the purpose of banning the exports of goods and high technology viewed as strategic to the East. Currently Cocom includes NATO countries, except Iceland and also Japan and Australia. Oleg Shchedrov comments.

The softening will involve three areas, telecommunication facilities, computers, and machine tools. This is an important step considering that these areas include about one half of the entire list of restrictions. Besides, judging by reports, participants in the conference in Paris decided to compile before the year ends new Cocom lists which, as the [AGENCE] FRANCE PRESS says, will exclude the produce of 30 out of the 116 industries mentioned there earlier.

In the light of the Soviet perestroyka and rapid change in Eastern Europe the almost comprehensive Cocom's blacklist was subjected to criticism even by some Cocom members. Nevertheless the committee had to hold three sessions even for partially altering the situation. Analysts attribtue this not only to political motives but also to the sharp competition between the United States, Japan, and the unifying Western Europe. In its current dimensions Cocom makes it possible for Washington to keep its partners' trade with the East under effective control. According to experts the emerging liberalization of Cocom's policy opens opportunities for easing economic contacts between East and West. The REUTERS quotes an unnamed European participant in the Paris conference as saying that the number of applications for export licenses whould be reduced to 200 a year as compared with the current 1,500. It will be possible to sell the other items without Cocom's permission.

As a matter of fact participants in the Paris conference were not consistent in everything. For instance they decided to virtually refrain from controlling exports to Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. On the one hand this step can only be welcomed but on the other there are certain conditions made by the Cocom and one of them is this: The delivered technology must not go to other countries Cocom's restrictions are aimed at, first of all to the Soviet Union. Another stipulation is an unconditional end to the links between the secret services of the three countries with the KGB. One can turn this into a joke by noting that nowadays even the Central Intelligence Agency has contacts with the KGB in regard to combatting terrorism. But speaking seriously, such restrictions might create considerable difficulties in trade between members of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, which involves all—Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the USSR.

United States & Canada

U.S. Senate Committee Opposes New Embassy Funds

LD0806091690 Moscow TASS in English 0728 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezkhov]

[Text] Washington June 8 TASS—The U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday unanimously turned down the Bush administration's request to assign 270 million dollars for a plan to pull down the unfinished U.S. Embassy building in Moscow and to build a new one on the same foundation.

All the 16 committee members expressed their opinions during a debate on a bill on additional U.S. State Department expenditures in the 1991 fiscal year to the tune of 620 million dollars.

They adopted an amendment which unambiguously rejects the administration's plans and endorsed the provision of only 50 million dollars to build new shielded premises in the embassy compound.

The amendment was sponsored by Democratic Senator Daniel Moynihan. In their speeches senators voiced doubt about the advisability of implementing such a costly project at a time when Soviet-American relations are improving.

On April 26 the House Foreign Affairs Committee voted in favour of assigning 300 million dollars for the construction of a new embassy building in Moscow but put forward a condition under which the State Department should submit a construction project to the Congress for endorsement.

Administration plans about a new embassy buiulding in Moscow were announced by the State Department on December 20, last year. The pulling down of the unfinished building and building a new one are expected to take more than five years and cost 270 million dollars.

The United States maintains that listening devices were planted during the construction of the embassy's administrative building, which rendered it unfit for use. The construction was discontinued in 1985.

The Soviet Union rejected these assertions and launched counter-charges. During the row that flared up two years ago over the problem, the Soviet side, at a news conference in Washington, demonstrated numerous listening devices removed from the walls, concrete floors and other structural elements of the new [illegible] ding of the Soviet Embassy. The U.S. side did not produce such physical proofs.

Under an inter-governmental agreement the administrative buildings of the American and Soviet Embassies may be turned over for use simultaneously. However, the problem still remains unresolved up to now.

Reportage, Commentary Continue on Gorbachev Visit

Bush Comments on Summit

LD0906131190 Moscow TASS in English 1300 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy]

[Text] Washington June 9 TASS—"Every summit between America and the Soviet Union is shaped by history, and I believe that last week's summit will alter history," President George Bush said at a fundraising luncheon in Omaha, Nebraska on Friday.

"In four days of talks," he said, "we discussed the power of freedom to dismantle walls between nations. And because the greatest peace dividend is a safer, more democratic world, we signed agreements concerning area of interests to both our countries and recorded bilateral understandings in several joint statements.

"First, we signed a bilateral agreement that will for the first time eliminate the great majority of chemical weapons that have been stockpiled over the years. And our common goal is nothing less than a global ban on these devastating chemical weapons.

"Second, I joined President Gorbachev in signing protocols on limiting nuclear testing, and they will create unprecedented improvements for on-site verification on the threshold test ban treaty and the peaceful nuclear explosions treaty.

"And the third agreement updates and expands our 1973 pact on the peaceful uses of atomic energy, increasing our cooperation in atomic energy research and civilian nuclear safety. You know, that the tragic Chernobyl accident shows that the fate of our planet eclipses ideology and nation and the agreements we signed can help create a better future for the community of nations.

"Last week, President Gorbachev and I learned more about each other. And so, in addition to our agreements, we also signed understandings. We released a joint statement on strategic arms limitations, recording our agreement on major outstanding issues governing a START treaty. We pledged to continue future negotiations on nuclear and space arms, and we also issued a statement on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe [CFE], the CFE area. A CFE agreement is crucial to a Europe that is whole and free. [no closing quotes as received]

Speaking in particular about the trade agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States, President Bush said that it "will relax barriers between East and West".

"Let me be candid," the President continued to say. "Serious differences still remain between us and the Soviets". He pointed to the future of the Baltic republics, German reunification and the emigration from the Soviet Union.

"I have often said we want perestroika to succeed, and I believe that. I believe it is in the interests of the United

States that those internal reforms keep going forward so they move towards economic reform and more human rights," Bush stressed.

Talking on board the aircraft to reporters who accompanied him on his two-day trip across the American midwest, the President noted that all international leaders with whom he had discussed (mainly on the telephone) the results of the Gorbachev summit, said they felt encouraged by the summit and its atmosphere.

Bush Cited on New Era

LD0806111390 Moscow TASS in English 1050 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy]

[Text] Washington June 8 TASS—"We're entering a new era in U.S.-Soviet relations," President George Bush said on Thursday in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. "Just this past Sunday, President Gorbachev paid a visit to your neighbours in Minnesota. And I'm pleased to share with you my thoughts on what I believe was a very productive summit."

"We signed a number of agreements: on deep reductions in our chemical weapons arsenals, on reaching rapid closure on major outstanding issues governing a strategic arms treaty, protocols on nuclear testing, and agreements on trade and grain sales.

"But perhaps even more important than the agreements we signed is the progress we made in understanding the great political challenges that we face—a united Germany in NATO, the future of the Baltics, regional problems.

"These aren't questions that can be solved simply or in one single summit meeting. But we make progress on these difficult issues. And I am grateful to Mr. Gorbachev for the forthright spirit in which he addressed every issue on the table. And I take it as proof that we have indeed entered a new era in our relations with the Soviet Union.

"Of course, we have differences," Bush said. "I want to see Lithuania have its freedom. We are committed to self-determination for the Baltic states. And although I take great pleasure and joy, am pleased that the emigration of Soviet Jews is at an all-time high, I want to see unfettered emigration. And we differ on Cuba and for now, on a united Germany in NATO, and on many other issues as well. But, as I chattered informally with President Gorbachev up there in Camp David, I kept thinking that this new Soviet leader, committed to reform and openness, is indeed a remarkable man."

"It was a good summit," Bush noted during the first stopover he made in Milwaukee in the course of a two-day tour of the U.S. mid-west, mainly devoted to raising money for Republican Party candidates to state offices.

Reagan Cited on Summit

LD1006134990 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 10 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Volnukhin]

[Text] Bonn June 10 TASS—Former U.S. President Ronald Reagan positively assessed the recent U.S.-Soviet summit in Washington. He told the West German weekly WELT AM SONNTAG that he was pleased with the Bush-Gorbachev summit's results.

He said that, although there remained differences between the two countries, the Washington-Moscow dialogue, started by the 1985 U.S.-Soviet summit in Geneva and subsequent meetings in Reykjavik, Moscow, Washington and New York, was becoming more and more intensive.

Speaking about his meeting with President Mikhail Gorbachev in San Francisco, Reagan said he and his wife were very touched by the friendliness with which the Gorbachevs greeted them.

During the meeting, the Soviet president was full of energy and frank, evading no questions, Reagan said, adding that Gorbachev was apparently satisfied with the summit's results.

Results Assessed

LD0706140190 Moscow TASS in English 1032 GMT 7 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovsky]

[Text] Washington June 7 TASS—The arms control association held a new conference on Wednesday on the results of the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush. Opening the news conference, the association's president and executive director Spurgeon Keeny said that the majority of comments on the summit describe it as a very important event, regard it as a success and expect it to influence the development of American-Soviet relations.

Keeny said that arms control obviously remains the key component of the summits, just as summit meetings are key components in decision-making and concluding work on arms control agreements. He said the great progress has apparently been made at the summit.

Agreement was reached in principle on most of the issues that remained unresolved and hampered formulating a treaty on strategic defensive arms. Both presidents also agreed to finish drafting the treaty this year.

Although a new agreement on conventional armaments in Europe has not been achieved, the two president agreed to formulate the treaty in the current year.

Noting that the presidents had signed an agreement on the destruction of chemical weapons and banning from their production and protocols to the treaties on nuclear tests and peaceful nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, Keeny emphasised that this was an important step towards achieving arms control agreements.

Northeast Asia

Further Reportage on Gorbachev-No Tae-u Meeting

Gorbachev Aides Reject Agreements

SK0906021790 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 8 Jun 90

[From the "Asian News" program under the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] People close to the president of the Soviet Union have strongly rejected the allegation by foreign news agencies that an agreement was reached during a meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and ROK President No Tae-u. For example, REUTER reported that the Soviet Union and the ROK will establish diplomatic relations in August and that the heads of state will exchange visits for reconciliation by year's end. It was pointed out that this report by REUTER was (?unfounded).

No Tae-u's remarks on an agreement that he and the Soviet Union will contribute to reforming the DPRK is also noteworthy. In connection with this, people close to the president of the Soviet Union pointed out Moscow's principled stand on rejecting any interference in the affairs of independent states.

Meeting To Promote Korean Peace

SK0806123390 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] ROK President No Tae-u pointed out that his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the Soviet Union, held in San Francisco was a historic turning point, and stressed that this will contribute to promoting peace on the Korean peninsula and Northeast Asia in general. During the meeting, the Soviet side said that this meeting was possible due to changes that began to take place in Asia and the Pacific. President Mikhail Gorbachev confirmed the Soviet Union's principled stand on the issue of peacefully reunifying Korea and made an affirmative response to establishing economic and cultural ties between the Soviet Union and the ROK. The issue of establishing diplomatic relations can be considered according to the development of ties and in the context of fundamentally improving the political situation in Asia and the Korean peninsula.

The ROK president arrived in Washington yesterday. He will notify U.S. President George Bush and leaders of the U.S. Congress of the result of his conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev.

In the meantime, the U.S. Department of State welcomed the meeting between No Tae-u and the president of the Soviet Union and pointed out that this would promote peace on the Korean peninsula and brighten prospects for the reunification of the fatherland.

Bush, No Tae-u Discuss Talks

SK0806122390 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] President Bush received South Korean President No Tae-u at the White House. The main purpose of this meeting was to discuss the conversation between Gorbachev, president of the Soviet Union, and President No Tae-u held in San Francisco and the issue of alleviating tension in the Pacific. After his conversation at the White House, President No Tae-u told reporters that during this conversation, he and President Gorbachev agreed that the two countries must cooperate and that his conversation with Gorbachev, president of the Soviet Union, was very significant and will contribute to alleviating tension on the Korean peninsula. After saying so, he expressed his hope that the San Francisco conversation will hasten progress in resolving the issue of reunifying Korea.

ROK President on Talks With Gorbachev

LD0806180590 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Varlamov]

[Text] Tokyo June 8 TASS—South Korean President No Tae-u has described his San Francisco meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev as "an event of historic importance", YONHAP news agency reported today.

The South Korean leader made the statement in Seoul upon his arrival from the United States where he also had talks with President George Bush.

No Tae-u observed that both great powers called for the solution of the conflict in the Korean Peninsula by combining efforts of the North and South.

He favoured a summit meeting with President Kim Il-song of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to discuss problems of reconciliation and unification.

Diplomatic Relations Not Confirmed

LD0906101690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] "Television News Service" has already mentioned reports by foreign news agencies, including REUTER reports, alleging that after Gorbachev met No Tae-u, the USSR and South Korea would establish full diplomatic relations. Even a precise date, August, was given. According to today's report by Moscow radio, sources close to the USSR president have not confirmed either these reports or the conjecture that Moscow and Seoul have decided to exchange visits at the highest level before the end of this year.

ROK To Normalize Ties With PRC

SK0806125190 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 7 Jun 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] ROK President No Tae-u expressed his firm belief that his meeting with the president of the Soviet Union held a few days ago in San Francisco, the United States, would contribute to alleviating tension on the Korean peninsula. After his talks with U.S. President Bush, he spoke yesterday at a news conference in Washington. No Tae-u reported the results of his historic talks with the Soviet leader to Bush. The ROK president declared that the task of normalizing relations with China is upon us. He said that the ROK is willing to hold talks with China on the highest level. The two countries have promoted wide-ranging cooperation in the economic and trade fields. As already known, China and the ROK have not established diplomatic relations.

No Tae-u's Probable Visit to Beijing

SK0806123990 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] YONHAP, a ROK news agency, reported that on the occasion of the opening of the Asian games scheduled to be held in September 1990 in the capital of China, ROK President No Tae-u will be able to visit Beijing. Quoting (?governmental sources), YONHAP reported that the ROK has taken broad-based steps to improve its relations with the DPRK and China. This will contribute to consolidating peace and stability in Northeast Asia and alleviating tension on the Korean peninsula.

Quoting official data, CHUNGANG ILBO, a ROK newspaper, reported that the ROK Government would promote official and non-official contacts with Beijing in July and August and are trying to arrange high-level meetings between the ROK and China. This newspaper confirmed the YONHAP report that the government [words indistinct] President No Tae-u's talks on the occasion of the Asian games.

No Urges Talks With Kim Il-song

SK1106045890 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] South Korean President No Tae-u stated that the talks with the USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev in San Francisco were an event of historical significance.

According to the YONHAP NEWS AGENCY on 8 June, the South Korean leader explained this upon his arrival in Seoul after visiting the United States.

President No Tae-u also held talks with President Bush in the United States.

The South Korean president insisted that the two powers are making an appeal for the settlement of the division of the Korean peninsula through efforts by the North and South and that high-level talks with the DPRK President Kim Il-song be held. The South Korean president also proposed that in the process of these high-level talks, both sides should make compromises and hold discussions on the issue of the reunification of Korea.

Ovchinnikov on Impact of Talks

PM1106091790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "Viewpoint": "About the San Francisco Meeting"]

[Text] The USSR president's trip to Canada and the United States was unusually rich in events. But probably no episode in it caused such a sensation as M.S. Gorbachev's meeting in San Francisco with South Korean President No Tae-u. It created a virtual avalanche of comments throughout the world.

According to an official White House spokesman, President Bush welcomed the meeting as "a historic event which improved the prospects for lowering tension on the Korean peninsula and uniting Korea." Bush confirmed that the United States supports Seoul's policy aimed at establishing ties with socialist states and seeks to promote better relations between South and North Korea.

It is significant that official Beijing circles also commented on the San Francisco meeting in the same vein. Yuan Mu, spokesman for the PRC State Council, declared: "We followed the meeting of M.S. Gorbachev and No Tae-u at the time of the Soviet leader's U.S. visit. The Chinese Government welcomes any actions by any country if they promote the North-South dialogue and positive processes on the Korean peninsula." There are reports that South Korea is negotiating with China on a visit by No Tae-u to Beijing, which would be tied to the opening of the Asian Games soon to be held there but which would have the chief aim of a top-level meeting between the two countries' leaders.

Commentaries in the world press cite the USSR president's words that the San Francisco meeting was made possible in the context of the positive changes which have been initiated in the Asia-Pacific region. In an editorial expressively entitled "Breakthrough" THE WASHINGTON POST points out that the thaw between Moscow and Seoul is creating preconditions for the spread of detente from Europe to Asia and, in the final analysis, for Korea's reunification. Henceforth, according to the newspaper, an additional boost to better relations between Washington and Pyongyang has emerged. Beijing, which, naturally, must also participate in consultations on a Korean settlement, is also expanding ties with Seoul. It is desirable to involve Japan in the consultations too. Of course, THE WASHINGTON POST concludes, the Korean problem cannot be settled through the efforts of outsiders. This can be arrived at only as a result of talks between the two Koreas.

How true that is! The Soviet Union's principled positions on the question of Korea's peaceful reunification, which M.S. Gorbachev confirmed in conversation with No Tae-u, are founded precisely on this.

Kim Tae-chung, leader of the South Korean opposition, called the San Francisco meeting a step toward ending the "cold war" on the Korean peninsula and a strong boost to the development of bilateral economic ties. According to press reports, Seoul is considering the question of granting government and bank loans to the USSR to a value of $3-4 billion. "The Soviet Union," the Japanese newspaper TOKYO SHIMBUN points out, "is interested in an influx of capital, technology, and goods from South Korea. This is also important for the USSR because the grounds for the presence of U.S. Armed Forces in this region will be eliminated as a result of improved Soviet-South Korean relations." France's LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS also arrives at the same conclusion. "Washington does not rule out the possibility," it writes, "that the improvement of relations between Moscow and Seoul could lead to a reduction of the U.S. military contingent stationed in South Korea."

On the last day of May the DPRK advanced an important initiative: to carry out large-scale disarmament in the North and the South, sharply limit military exercises, and create an open peace zone along the demarcation line on the 38th parallel. We would like to hope that under the new conditions that have taken shape since the San Francisco meeting Seoul will make a constructive response to these proposals and Pyongyang will take advantage of the favorable opportunities for a North-South dialogue.

The profound impact that the San Francisco meeting has had on the political atmosphere in the Asia-Pacific region is borne out particularly graphically by the comments on it in Japan. The meeting of Gorbachev and No Tae-u shook Tokyo's official circles no less than Nixon's visit to Beijing once did. It was totally unexpected and has necessitated a revision of Japanese policy in the Asia-Pacific region. As Foreign Minister Nakayama declared in parliament, the Japanese Government regards the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and South Korea as an event marking the start of a new epoch in Asia. Under these conditions, Nakayama declared, it would be expedient for the foreign ministers of Asian states to meet for regular consultations in the way their European colleagues do.

This statement is very significant, because until recently official Tokyo circles avoided a collective discussion of problems of Asian and Pacific security. They maintained that, before beginning something like the all-European process in Asia, it is necessary to settle regional conflicts, among which the problem of the "northern territories" was also included.

A proposal to discuss the question of reducing military confrontation in Northeast Asia on a multilateral basis was advanced by M.S. Gorbachev in Krasnoyarsk as much as two years ago. No Tae-u has advocated such talks with the participation of the Soviet Union, the United States, Japan, China, and North and South Korea, and not so long ago this idea was supported by Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu. Comments on the San Francisco meeting attest that real opportunities are opening up for the 38th parallel to cease to be the final front of the "cold war."

Commentary on Meeting

SK0906080590 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 5 Jun 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] A meeting was held between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and ROK President No Tae-u on Monday in San Francisco. The meeting was the first contact between the leaders of the two countries, which do not have diplomatic relations. The meeting lasted more than one hour. The talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and No Tae-u, which began one and a half hours later than scheduled, were held at the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco. Regarding this, station commentator (Oleg Sidorov) reports in detail as follows:

Before the talks were held, Mikhail Gorbachev made a speech at Stanford University. During the speech, while paying special attention to the changing situation in Asia, he declared that he plans to develop wider contacts with countries in the region.

The Soviet leader indicated that Korea is one of the Asian nations from which the Soviet Union can learn. Observers believe that Gorbachev's tendency to give Asian policy priority relative to other Soviet policies made his meeting with No Tae-u possible. The meaning behind the first high-level contact between Moscow and Seoul shows the interests of [words indistinct] participants.

On Monday No Tae-u met former U.S. President Ronald Reagan, who was staying at the same hotel. Richard Solomon, assistant U.S. secretary of state for Asian and Pacific affairs, met with the ROK president. No Tae-u also met some other U.S. [word indistinct].

The talks between Gorbachev and No Tae-u, which lasted more than an hour, were held in private. Consequently, the two sides did not publicly release details of the talks, even after the talks had ended.

President No Tae-u told reporters that the establishment of ROK-Soviet diplomatic relations would result from the talks. However, he did not disclose when diplomatic relations might be established. In an interview with a ROK television station, he said that future steps that require time should be taken to achieve diplomatic relations. However, we [words indistinct].

Quoting Gorbachev's remarks, No Tae-u said that the recent meeting signified only the start of the process of normalizing relations. After the meeting, Gorbachev said that he promised to meet with No because we maintain trade relations with the ROK. Referring to the overall issue of Pacific affairs, Mikhail Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union plans to improve relations with all countries in the region, adding that the Soviet Union will not improve relations with only some.

It is extremely difficult to correctly predict what will result from the first meeting between Gorbachev and No Tae-u. In conclusion, however, (Oleg Sidorov) writes that the meeting itself displays the logical outcome of earlier steps taken by Moscow and Seoul to establish bilateral contacts.

North Korea Returns Remains of U.S. Soldiers

SK0706020090 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 29 May 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] Yesterday in Panmunjom, located on the demarcation line that divides the Korean peninsula, North Korean delegates delivered to a U.S. congressional delegation the remains of five U.S. soldiers who died in the 1950-1953 Korean war. Observers regard this step by the DPRK as one aimed at improving relations with the United States.

In connection with this development, the ROK Government issued a statement welcoming this sincere step by Pyongyang and expressed sincere hope for the formation of relations between North and South Korea.

According to data kept by the United States, the remains of about 800 U.S. soldiers are in North Korea. Their families are trying to have the remains returned to their fatherland.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Shevardnadze Meets With Cambodia's Hun Sen

LD0806232890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1630 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze had a conversation today with Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers and foreign minister of the state of Cambodia. He visited Moscow en route from Tokyo.

Hun Sen told Shevardnadze about the results of his meeting with Prince Norodom Sihanouk. During it an agreement was reached on constituting a Supreme National Council as a symbol of Cambodia's neutrality, sovereignty, and the country's national unity. The participants in the Tokyo meeting spoke in favor of restraint in the use of force and stated their readiness to bring things to a cease- fire at the moment of the convocation of the Supreme National Council. A joint communique on the results of the meeting stated the necessity of renewing the Paris conference on Cambodia with proper UN participation to adopt the measures necessary to verify the withdrawal of all foreign troops and halt all types of external military aid, and also monitor the practical implementation of the cease-fire agreements.

The Cambodia leader said that the Cambodian Government was ready to stick to the path mapped out in Tokyo and to cooperate actively with all those who are sincerely interested in achieving a comprehensive political settlement of the Cambodian problem.

E.A. Shevardnadze noted that the Tokyo meeting was a serious success, and a more specific step towards the elimination of the conflict on the basis of the sides' goodwill and the search for mutually acceptable compromises.

The Soviet side was satisfied with the results of the Tokyo meeting and the important agreements reached by Hun Sen and Norodom Sihanouk, primarily those dealing with the creation of the Supreme National Council and with measures to achieve cease-fire. The agreements will promote the continuation of an effective dialogue between various Khmer groups and will become an impetus for a further advance towards a comprehensive settlement of the Cambodian problem.

The USSR foreign minister expressed, in principle, his support for the policy of the Cambodian state aimed at achieving a political settlement of the conflict and the achievement of national reconciliation in the interests of building a peaceful Cambodian home, and with the aims of establishing good neighborliness and stability in southeast Asia.

Both came to the opinion that the Tokyo meeting was possible thanks to the growth in the dynamics of the talks process on Cambodia on various levels: between the Cambodian sides, and on a regional and international level. The efforts of various countries, including Thailand and Japan, deserve positive appraisal. The results of the meeting in Tokyo would be much more weighty if it were not for the obstructive position of the Khmer Rouge, who, despite promises previously given, boycotted the talks.

Both sides expressed the hope that the permanent members of the UN Security Council, as well as other countries participating in the international conference on Cambodia, will support the approaches agreed in Tokyo toward solving the primary issues of settlement and will assist in their practical implementation. In this context the importance of the Vietnam-Chinese dialogue was noted.

It was stressed that the particular role of the international community is, taking into account the lessons of the recent tragic past of Cambodia, to ensure the observance of all human rights in this country, not to allow the restoration of the genocide regime there, and also to guarantee the future status of Cambodia as an independent, neutral, and nonaligned state.

The two spoke with approval of the activization of the UN's activity in the settlement process, including the holding of general elections in Cambodia.

The conversation took place in a business-like, comradely atmosphere.

Tokyo Talks Evaluated

PM1106125790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Viktor Pritula's "Viewpoint" article: "Demarche by 'Khmer Rouge'"]

[Text] The meeting of the opposing Cambodian sides in Tokyo was viewed with hope and fears in Cambodia itself, in Southeast Asia, and throughout the world. It was hoped that it would be possible to take another step along the road toward unblocking a conflict which has persisted for many years and which is poisoning the political climate in a region which in recent years has been changing from an arena of confrontation into a field of cooperation. The fears were evoked by Prince Sihanouk's umpteenth threat, voiced after the talks in the Thai resort of Phatthaya, to quit the political arena.

Nonetheless, the Tokyo round of the talks did take place. Did it vindicate the hopes and dispel the fears? It is impossible to answer this question unequivocally. On the one hand, despite everything, Tokyo saw the signing of a joint communique which can be viewed as an important contribution to the cause of a peaceful settlement in Cambodia since it contains an accord on a cease-fire no later than the end of July, when Cambodia's Supreme National Council is to be formed with the participation of all the parties involved in the conflict. This document may be of fundamental importance for the peaceful future of long-suffering Cambodia. However, it still lacks the signature of the representative of the 'Khmer Rouge,' the most powerful opposition grouping in military terms. Their leader, Khieu Samphan, once again quit the negotiating table, thus demonstrating blatant unwillingness to resolve the problem by political means.

The Tokyo demarche of Pol Pot's successors is yet more proof that the threat of the reinstatement of the genocide regime in Cambodia is by no means hollow words or a propaganda trick on the part of Phnom Penh. The 40,000-strong 'Khmer Rouge' armed formations continue to sow death and destruction on Cambodian soil. Unable to win significant military successes on the battlefield, they are resorting to sabotage and terror against the civilian population. Roads and bridges are being mined, crops burned, and attacks on industrial installations mounted. The aim is to destabilize the situation in the country.

Nonetheless, in my opinion, the latest slamming of the door in Tokyo is a reflection of the political bankruptcy of the Pol Pot leadership, which is perfectly aware that it has no chance of winning in a free election in Cambodia.

Alekseyev on Meeting's Results

BK0906094590 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Station observer Oleg Alekseyev's commentary]

[Text] Frankly speaking, no other meetings among the Cambodian factions had ever drawn such great attention of the world community as the 4-5 June Tokyo meeting did. The conclusion drawn by most observers is similar; that is, the Tokyo meeting has been a turning point on the difficult road toward seeking the Cambodian solution. Our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev, makes the following comments:

Such an assessment on the Tokyo meeting has also been made by a participant himself, that is, Comrade Hun Sen, head of the Phnom Penh government. In a press statement regarding his talks with Samdech Sihanouk, leader of the Cambodian opposition groups, which resulted in a joint communique, Comrade Hun Sen said that this was undeniably a great success.

It should be recalled that this joint communique called for a cease-fire among the warring factions. What has happened now? It is clear that following the issuance of the joint communique in Tokyo, a new situation is prevailing in Cambodia. The recognized leader of the Cambodian opposition, Samdech Sihanouk, and leader of a group in the opposition side, Mr. Son Sann who sides with the samdech, have stated clearly that they would cease military activities for the settlement of the Cambodian problem. A similar stance is also supported by Phnom Penh.

The sole obstacle on the road toward restoring peace is the hardheaded Khmer Rouge, whose leader Khieu Samphan had refused to sign the Tokyo agreement. The world community has similarly interpreted this event as displaying the Khmer Rouge's desire to continue the war. This was also predicted by Sihanouk himself.

However, in my opinion, there are sufficient grounds to express optimism prudently, and it is true that the Khmer Rouge are now isolated in the international arena due to their destructive attitude on the Tokyo meeting. Regarding this matter, observers have paid particular attention to the stance of China and Thailand. According to Comrade Hun Sen, China has made quite an effort to adjust its stance. As for Thailand, as Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan has said, Bangkok has always tried its best to bring about a cease-fire and a solution to the Cambodian problem through political means.

I would also like to recall the statement made in Tokyo by Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama that Japan expected Beijing and Bangkok would be able to urge the Khmer Rouge to sign an agreement with the other groups and end the war.

In conclusion, our observer, Comrade Oleg Alekseyev, said there is another point worth mentioning in connection with this matter. As Comrade Hun Sen stressed in his press conference in Tokyo, his government did not intend to bar the Khmer Rouge from the political solution in Cambodia. According to Comrade Hun Sen, the door is still open for them, and they may later join in implementing the agreement on the cease-fire.

Cambodian Rubber Production, Delivery Disrupted

PM0706125190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent P. Tsvetov: "When Not Only the Trees Weep"]

[Excerpt] Kampong Cham-Phnom Penh—[passage omitted] Many specialists believe that Soviet-Cambodian cooperation in the field of natural rubber production is very promising and advantageous. Right now a considerable proportion of our requirements for this raw material are met by deliveries from Malaysia, for which we pay in freely convertible currency. At the same time some specialists believe there is a possibility of satisfying the demand for this valuable raw material with imports from Cambodia and Vietnam which do not involve hard currency. We only have to render specific technical assistance to these countries, which is done on the basis of long-term intergovernmental agreements.

With regard to Cambodia it is envisaged that the Soviet side deliver the necessary equipment and materials to the sum of 45 million rubles while the Cambodians will pay for this with annual deliveries of natural rubber.

The Cambodians are fulfilling their commitments punctiliously. A different tendency is emerging increasingly frequently on our side, however. Thus in the first quarter last year's plan for deliveries of ammonia, acetic acid, and polyethylene film was not fulfilled and without them the production and export of rubber are impossible. The Cambodians rightly fear that when, with the start of the rainy season, the latex flows abundantly, there will be nothing with which to process it. No construction work is under way on the plantations because cement is not being delivered (6,500 tonnes were promised and not one has arrived). Deliveries of equipment for a diesel electric power station in Memot have not been completed. And without electricity the new manufacturing lines at the processing plant cannot operate.

The Soviet side explains the disruption of deliveries by references to objective difficulties like the poor operation of rail transport on USSR territory. But surely our difficulties cannot be compared with the Cambodian difficulties? People are working on the plantations at a risk to their own lives.

There are also difficult working conditions at the processing shops: The equipment is old and primitive and almost everything is done manually. Men and women work with sheets of rubber up to their waists in caustic sludge. Last year the situation was complicated because of the drought and the trees produced little sap. Nonetheless the enterprises met the plan for rubber deliveries to the USSR.

Staffers at the Soviet Embassy and trade mission in Cambodia believe that departments often use talk of difficulties to conceal their own uncooperative approach.

Cambodia today can perfectly well resolve many of its own economic problems through links with the West which, although it does not recognize the Phnom Penh government diplomatically, has always had active contacts with it. But the Cambodians want to continue cooperation with us, believing the signed agreements will be fulfilled. Will people remember this in Moscow and other cities of the Union?

East Europe

Polish Government Cited on Economic Achievements

PM0706132390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "The Decision Was Correct"]

[Text] Warsaw, 6 Jun—The five months of the government's work this year, during which key measures have been implemented to stabilize the national economy and to introduce market mechanisms, make it possible to state that the decision to realize both these tasks in parallel was correct. This is the conclusion reached by the Polish Council of Ministers.

The government noted the successes achieved in fulfilling the program to stabilize the economy and in putting it on a market footing. The elimination of all forms of administrative distribution of products and services; the widening of the sphere of application of free prices from 50 to 90 percent of goods; the lowering of inflation; and the introduction of internal convertibility for the national currency—the zloty—were defined, above all, as the main achievements.

Further on Gorbachev's Meeting With Jaruzelski

PM0806105790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting with W. Jaruzelski"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR, met with W. Jaruzelski, president of the Republic of Poland, on 7 June.

Questions of Soviet-Polish cooperation were broached during the conversation.

The interlocutors confirmed their belief in the need for, and prospects for, comprehensive and equitable Soviet-Polish cooperation in the interests of the two countries' peoples and lasting peace and stability in Europe.

N.I. Ryzhkov and T. Mazowiecki took part in the meeting.

The conversation was held in a constructive spirit and was characterized by frankness and mutual understanding.

Hungary's Antall Thanks Ryzhkov for Greetings

PM0806141190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Morning Edition p4

[Hungarian Prime Minister Jozsef Antall untitled message to N.I. Ryzhkov]

[Text] To Mr. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

I thank you for the kind wishes you sent me on my election as prime minister. I assure you that the government of the Hungarian Republic will do everything necessary to further develop good neighborly relations between our countries on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. I wish you continued success in your work for the good of the USSR peoples.

[Signed] Jozsef Antall, prime minister of the Hungarian Republic.

Ryzhkov, Antall Discuss Bilateral Relations

LD0806192290 Moscow TASS in English 1818 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and his Hungarian counterpart Jozsef Antall, during a discussion in the Kremlin today, exchanged views on bilateral relations in the conditions of drastic changes that are taking place in the Soviet Union and Hungary, in Europe and the world at large.

Ryzhkov observed that the USSR appreciates the substantial positive potential accumulated by the two countries in establishing extensive interaction in the political, economic and humanitarian spheres and international affairs.

Longstanding trade and economic cooperation and the considerable volume of vital deliveries between the two countries determined the high degree of interdependence in their economic complexes, which is an objective reality.

The need to preserve and develop everything that is productive and valuable and serves the interests of both states and the well- being of their peoples is quite natural therefore.

Antall agreed with this approach. He expressed Hungary's aspiration to build relations with the Soviet Union on the basis of goodneighbourliness, full equality and mutual benefit.

The Hungarian Government counts on the Soviet Union's remaining Hungary's important political and economic partner.

Ryzhkov and Antall considered Soviet-Hungarian trade and economic relations in the light of the drastic restructuring of the mechanism of cooperation in connection with the planned trade in hard currency at world prices.

The two gave much attention to financial and property issues connected with the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungarian territory.

The Soviet side stressed the need for their earliest solution to satisfy both sides, including compensation for the facilities left behind by the southern group of troops, as well as the possibility to put them to civilian use, including by establishing joint ventures.

West Europe

Further on Visit of British Prime Minister

Joint News Conference 8 Jun

LD0806161690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1330 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Joint news conference given by President Mikhail Gorbachev and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in the press center of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Thatcher speaks in English with superimposed Russian translation—live]

[Text] [Gorbachev] Good evening. I present to you our guest, Margaret Thatcher, the prime minister of Great Britain. Allow me to begin our news conference, and by way of a short introduction on my part I would like to say that I regard the present meeting with Mrs. Thatcher in the context of the active political dialogue which has marked recent weeks and perhaps months, and most likely we are all well aware of what is at issue here.

If one takes into account that we have here the leaders of two countries who are linked by very long traditions of cooperation, if one takes into account that in recent years political dialogue between our countries, between the leadership of the two countries, has reached a high level and is marked by a high level of content—and I would say, of effectiveness, which transforms it—I would say once again and I would even stress this, into an important factor of European politics and the worldwide process.

Today I spent several hours with Mrs. Thatcher discussing the most major and topical problems of the present day. The assessment of the summit meeting which has just taken place in Washington occupied first place. Mrs. Thatcher and I both attribute great importance to what happened during those days in the United States. We both think that it is important not only that the agreements reached there should be implemented and that nothing should be lost, but also that the cooperation, and perhaps partnership, which distinguished it should be continued in our common interests.

Taking into account yesterday's sitting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee and on the eve of the NATO Council, which, it seems, will be held in London, we have substantially talked about the place of both alliances in the European process, especially in relation to the German question, in relation to the external aspects of German reunification. We see opportunities for forming new relations between the two blocs in the course of their transformation, in connection with the progress of disarmament and the removal of military confrontation in Europe, at least, the reduction of the confrontation in Europe as a first stage. As far as I have understood Mrs. Thatcher, we see a possibility for interaction between these two military-political organizations in preparing new structures of common European security. Naturally, great attention was paid to the German problem. I outlined in detail our arguments and concerns. Mrs. Thatcher confirmed that she understands the need for taking maximum account of our opinion. I gave more than once in the United States, and give again here a detailed account of my reasons to Mrs. Thatcher. The central thought of my reasoning remains the same: One should not confine oneself to some specific option because it will inevitably be one-sided. What is needed is an intensive exchange, an intensive search, a comparison of views and proposals so as to reach the best possible option which would satisfy everyone and, what is the main thing, which would facilitate the development and strengthening of the positive processes in Europe and the world, and which would not become, would not turn out to be, a brake on this process under any circumstances.

We have both confirmed our position that the Germans have a right to live in a unified state. However, the final summing up of the results of the war is not a matter for the Germans alone. The two-plus-four mechanism is already in existence. It should play its role to the full. It stems from the results of the war—I have here this role in mind—and not from the division of Germany. As everyone knows, this took place later.

Naturally, in the context of the all-European process we also talked about the participation by all European states. During the conversation Mrs. Thatcher showed interest in the current situation in the Soviet Union. I highly value her invariable interest in our perestroyka and her position on this issue and I see in this not only an expression of human solidarity with our people and country, but also a profound understanding of the Soviet Union's role in today's world, and of the enormous significance of what is taking place in this huge country, within the framework of its renewal—the enormous significance for civilization and peace throughout the world.

I now defer to Mrs. Thatcher.

[Thatcher] First, Mr. President, I would like to thank you in the warmest manner for giving me so much time, considering that you recently returned from an exceptionally successful summit meeting in Washington. This was an extremely tense time for you and it was a successful measure which moved the whole of the world to a better understanding and to understand each other's point of view by means of dialogue, in order to crystallize the subject, to find a way ahead, and find a way to a better world.

This morning we had a very interesting and in-depth, friendly discussion. That is yet another chapter in the series of those discussions that we have had. It was an opportunity to examine all those issues yet again and to examine them, as Mr. President has said, with respect to which paths should be taken into the future.

I also had a meeting with Mr. Ryzhkov. We discussed the situation here in your country. And there was also a very interesting hour-long meeting with Marshal Yazov. The main conversation, however, was with Mr. President. As you know, we really do decisively support those changes, those reforms that are taking place at the present time in the Soviet Union . These are the most impressive, the biggest historical changes which have occurred in Europe in a very long time. And naturally, if they are crowned with success, then the cause of freedom will be considerably advanced. And this will lead to the most exceptional changes in our century. That deserves our complete support, not only with regard to the peoples of the Soviet Union, but also on the part of those peoples that support the economics of the free market. The President has stressed and has already singled out the most important issues that we discussed. Naturally, we discussed the consequences of the unification of Germany. And you know our opinion, that Germany should remain in NATO. It should be free to choose its alliance obligations, but we should also understand that the Soviet Union, the Warsaw Pact Organization, should demand an assurance that their security is ensured. We must find possibilities to give such assurances in what, as I have already said, relates to the NATO countries, whose representatives I spoke with yesterday.

I would also like to stress that in British universities we do not give the necessary attention to the study of Russia. Therefore, we have instituted 10 new departments of Russian studies in British universities and we hope that that will lead to numerous exchanges between British and Soviet universities.

We also signed an agreement on cooperation, which will take into account such things as the training and teaching of the representatives of business circles and also all those various specific issues that, when put together, will allow the Soviet Union and its people to realize how the changes that they are striving for can be brought about. One thing is to define one's tasks clearly, that is, a movement to a free market economy, and one should also realize that one needs certain rules here and it is necessary... [changes thought] It is hardly possible to speak about it in two or three sentences. One should take account of reality, and especially the reality of the people who got used to living in different conditions—conditions that brought neither the prosperity they hoped for, nor freedom. It is necessary on our side to help in everything so that this goal can be achieved. At present we have a more peaceful world, a world with greater trust. However, we must preserve strong defense too, in order to prevent war, and for that we must ensure peace and aim at a higher standard of living for our peoples in order for them to take part in worldwide affairs. I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for this wonderful day and for the time you gave me, and I would like to confirm our support for those historic reforms that are taking place in the Soviet Union.

[Maslennikov] Ladies and gentlemen, we will now move on to questions. We agreed here that Mr. Ingham and I would take turns in allowing people to speak, as it were. So since I'm sitting on the right, let's (?take this side). Lobachenko please, from Soviet television.

[Lobachenko in English, with superimposed Russian translation] Madame Prime Minister, we are all happy to observe the stable development of relations between our two countries, especially over the past six years or, as you said, during the perestroyka period, the period of economic reform in our country under the leadership of our leader, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. What new paths of cooperation do you think there could be between our countries in the economic sphere?

[Thatcher] I think that we must persevere with the old ways. First, I have to say, that the market-based economy works and makes prosperity possible. This can be seen in Great Britain and most countries in West Europe. So there is no doubt that this economy works. The problem is how to change the attitudes of those who are accustomed to quite a different economy, and...in order to produce the appropriate results.

It is therefore necessary to train people to act within the framework of such an economy, to help them to act and conduct business precisely within the framework of this economy, not only with regard to production, but also in preserving products in order to get them to the market. And this is one of the conditions where the production of various goods is concerned. We must also show them how to ensure that the results of research—and I know there are fine research institutions in the Soviet Union—to ensure that the results of this research are exploited in industrial production so that they serve people. In order words, it is not a question of some magic recipes based on some kind of miracle. Many countries like ours are doing everything to show that this system works. This is what we are showing and we hope this is what will happen.

[Gorbachev] If you will permit me, I will tell you about an interesting conversation which I had at Stanford when I met a group of professors at that university. I also told Mrs. Thatcher about it today during our talks. Professor Friedman, the economist who is no doubt well known to many people, had a very interesting observation to make. He recalled that, after World War II, when the U.S. set out to help the Japanese build a modern economy, to master the forms of a market economy, a group of them, specialists, arrived in Japan. His first impression—he said this in public, therefore the Japanese correspondent listening to me must believe what I am saying. It's no secret, so to speak. Anyway, his impression, their impression, was that the people were wholly unprepared for working in the conditions which they wanted to propose. They were all very unhurried people. They lacked energy and initiative. They were absolutely not the right kind of human material, not the kind of people who could be used for new forms of economic organization. Subsequently he quickly changed his mind. You know how the Japanese work now, he said.

I talked about this in order to stress one important idea. There is no need to be afraid. There are great psychological obstacles when mastering new forms and methods, forms of life and methods of work, when going over to a different system. There are certain apprehensions. He is right, in fact. This alarm in connection with the discussion about a market and the transition to a market is making itself felt at the moment in our country, in our society. Quite a few resolutions about this have already been adopted, stating that although we advocate a market economy, it would be best to avoid the consequences connected with the transition, to avoid these difficulties. But it never happens that way. Everything has to be mastered.

Professor Friedman's view is that conditions, the economic system, the different environment force people to act and think in a different way. Therefore, we have to proceed resolutely, without fearing, so to speak, the initial difficulties.

By the way, I also told Mrs. Thatcher something I told you when I met you here, in this hall, together with President Mitterrand. I met leaseholders in the Kremlin recently, and they are the very people who are working under conditions which are necessary for a market economy. I was struck by their openness, judgement, experience, and initiative. They had so many proposals. That discussion ended with them setting around preparing a proposal for the president on how to do...what the mechanism should be like for the laws on land, ownership, and leasing to function effectively. These are already different people. I thought it was necessary to say this when you asked Mrs. Thatcher the question.

[Michael Brunson, in English, with superimposed Russian translation] Mr. President, ITN, London. I would like to ask this: With the passage of time since the summit meeting, and you are now holding a meeting with Mrs. Thatcher, are you less worried now by the issue of German unification and the fact that Germany might want to remain in NATO? Or, for example—something which Mrs. Thatcher has spoken about—

might the deployment of your troops in the East alleviate the situation for you to some extent? [Brunson can be heard in English saying "... and I wonder if some of the ideas that Mrs. Thatcher put forward today like, for example, the non-stationing of NATO troops in the East for a while, have helped to reassure you further?"]

[Gorbachev] Without going into detail, I would say that I think the discussion which I held in Washington—and we returned to it later at Camp David—was useful, since it gave both sides food for thought. Proposals are at the stage of maturing and taking shape, and a very intensive exchange is useful now. I retain the same approaches to solving this problem. I don't know whose version it will be. I told Mrs. Thatcher today: Whether it is the prime minister of Great Britain's version or somebody else's, it is not important who proposes it. What is important is that it should be a version which takes account of the realities, and balances interests and, thus, does not sow suspicions, but stimulates everything positive which has been born and is in progress on this continent.

I don't think that I will be revealing any especially great secret here by saying that we have reached the point where some specific things have appeared which should be considered and discussed on the basis of consultations—both between us and the United States and, through foreign ministries, with Great Britain—in order to get a more...I would put it like this: to come down from the philosophicial level to a level at which we elaborate on a policy with specific elements which correspond to the requirements of the version which I believe we all need. You know, that is possible, all the same. We talked at the Political Consultative Committee yesterday. You have read that concise, brief declaration today, but I believe you have discovered that it is a completely new document. It demonstrates that the Eastern countries are, in the first place, capable of seeing the positive things being done by our partners in the West, for we look at representatives of the West, not as opponents, but as partners in constructing new relations in Europe. That is the first observation it contains.

The second is an observation, or rather, an invitation to the NATO countries, when they assemble in July, to overcome the gap by which they are lagging behind the Warsaw Pact—specifically, to discuss their military doctrine, and in connection with that, to discuss what the structure of both NATO and its troops should be like, to discuss how that organization should be transformed in a manner corresponding to the processes going on in the Warsaw Pact.

You will have noticed that in the Warsaw Pact—and this is the third observation in that document—an entry has been made in that declaration for us to prepare proposals in the coming months, as early as this year, to enable us to reach agreement at a routine session of the Political Consultative Committee at the end of the year on specific measures that will mean reforming that military-political organization, with emphasis on the political. So, if the same processes are initiated in NATO, I tell you that will then open up opportunities for looking at those organizations in a new way, and not only from the point of view that they are in confrontation today—although defense ministers have already begun traveling and are perhaps competing today with foreign ministers in their visits—but also because...looking from this position at what then, in the new situation, might...looking at how they might interact, interact at the level of constructing new security—after all, they were created for security. [sentence as heard]

During the cold war period, they achieved it in one way. During that of building the European home, they must function in a different way. Given that government leaders, and indeed, governments themselves, are cooperating at the political level, these too—they are not isolated organizations, they are subordinate to the governments and must also sieze these changes and move toward them. I am not saying now that Mrs. Thatcher and I have spoken about specific forms and matters in this regard. I am simply pointing out the trend of thought during our conversation.

Nor is that all. If they are to cooperate in this way and then to begin—that means above all to expand the sphere of confidence in this most important area—and then a process of interpenetration begins as well, the question will arise as to whether the situation might not occur in which both blocs will be open and will declare their readiness to accept any other European state into their number. Why? If we are aiming at European, all-European structures and all-European security, we must cooperate more and more with all Europeans etc., etc. All in all, then, if one draws up, as it were, a number of the elements occurring in this discussion, I think it is possible to arrive at aspects of a foreign settlement on matters connected with unification that would consolidate what is positive and even provide an incentive. Or, one could simply work like a bull in a china shop. It turns to one side and brings down half the shop, it turns the other way and the whole place has been destroyed. If that is business, I don't envy any of us.

[Sofya Romanova] The SOVETSKAYA ZHENSHCHINA [SOVIET WOMAN] magazine, Sofya Romanova. Esteemed Madame Prime Minister, the world knows your qualities as a politician: firmness, resoluteness, and confidence. How well do these qualities of character match the image of Margaret Thatcher the woman?

[Thatcher] Perfectly. Next question.

[Gorbachev] A good question and a good answer.

[Unidentified correspondent in English with superimposed Russian translation] Mrs. Thatcher, could you respond to what Mr. President just said on the approach to NATO membership? Are you prepared to make gestures, such as not going on to modernize weapons?

[Thatcher] Mr. Gorbachev has already given you an account of how he sees the options for increasing security within the framework of the Warsaw Pact and also under conditions of possible German unification. I said yesterday at the NATO meeting that we must work very hard on these options to increase confidence, and I think this matches the new situation. We both must look at this new situation to see what can be done.

You asked whether we would be prepared to forego the modernization of nuclear weapons. I would say that both sides need a secure defense, and a secure defense that would serve both as an element of deterrence and an assurance that if something is happening it will enable one to react. In this way a secure defense can be provided if there is proper preparation and if there are modern weapons and technology. So one must not single out one kind of weapon and say it does not have to be modernized, because a secure defesne is the proper training of staff and modernized weapons according to what is necessary. So I think that if weapons remain they must be up to date. I think others think the same.

[Unidenitified correspondent] [Name indistinct] from the AL-ITTIHAD newspaper, the United Arab Emirates. I have two small questions: one for Mrs. Thatcher, and the second question for Mr Gorbachev. The first question: Do you agree that the anti-Iraqi campaign, in which Great Britain took part, was undertaken at the initiative of Zionism as a veil for Jewish immigration?

The second question is to Mr. President, Mikhail Gorbachev. During the last summit you said that Israel must pay attention to what the Soviet Union and the United States have to say, otherwise the Soviet Union will start thinking about the problem of emigration. Did you mean halting emigration or reducing it? How do you feel about the U.S.-Israeli reaction to this statement of yours, which we consider a very positive one?

[Thatcher] I would like to answer briefly. First, Great Britain doesn't adhere to an anti-Iraqi position. We have full diplomatic relations with Iraq and we have a number of people in Iraq. We are not against Iraq. Second, with regard to Israeli immigration and emigration from the Soviet Union to Israel we do everything to ensure this right for a greater number of people. Mr. Gorbachev has granted this right, and those willing to do it are free to do so.

I said, at a meeting with one of the Jewish organizations, and in other speeches, that it would be wrong if those leaving the Soviet Union settled in the occupied territories, the territories that we believe belong to others, and not to the State of Israel. I said that those of us who have been actively in favor of this cause are thus let down when they settle the Soviet emigrants in precisely this way.

I know that some Arab countries almost even accused Mr Gorbachev, and some of them spoke to me about this, and I reacted to it in a most resolute manner since Mr. Gorbachev is the one who granted all this freedom. Don't blame him for what he did. At the same time, we must see that these people do not settle in the territories that basically do not belong to the State of Israel. We clearly spoke about this position of ours.

[Gorbachev] I will answer only the second question, since everyone is aware of my statements and I do not want to repeat them. I only want to confirm that this is all very serious and we really hope that Israel heeds what was said during the days in Washington. I would say that Washington is aware of the gravity of the situation. I have, with satisfaction, just heard this from Mrs. Thatcher. Nevertheless, I hope that Israel will really pay heed to this. Then, in accordance with our legislation, this process can proceed normally as it has been doing, and we will not need to make any adjustments. If the situation indeed assumes a character where it is necessary to react somehow, I must say that we will probably have to avail ourselves of our sovereign rights and our powers to influence it.

[David Smith in English with superimposed Russian translation] David Smith, Channel Four news, London. President Gorbachev, I have two questions. First, what is your reaction to the decision in the Russian parliament which to all intents and purposes cancels...er, went against the existing legislation and declared Russia to be a sovereign republic? Also how will you work with Mr. Yeltsin? Will you be able to work together with him? [Question in English is: President Gorbachev, two questions. First of all what is your reaction to the decision in the Russian parliament this afternoon which effectively suspends Soviet law and seems to suggest that Russia will soon be a sovereign republic? And two: Are you planning to meet Mr. Yeltsin, and do you believe that you and Mr. Yeltsin can work together?"]

[Gorbachev] It seems to me that I have already answered these questions, but since the essence of the press is that it likes things grilled and what gives off an aroma rather than what is perhaps fundamental and requires greater attention, I will have to answer.

First, the Russian Federation Congress deputies have not yet adopted anything that contradicts the USSR Constitution and I am confident—you may ask how I would express my confidence in percentage terms—well, I am 100 percent confident that neither Russia's Congress of People's Deputies nor the Supreme Soviet that will be formed will embark on adopting laws that would damage the development of the federation and complicate the process of reforming it. I am a Russian myself and I known that in all Russians there is both a feeling of patriotism and a feeling of love for our Russian land. But there has long been in all our genes a responsibility transmitted from one generation to the next for good cohabitation and cooperation between all the peoples residing in this vast land. That is the way we have been formed and that is the environment we have had. That is the way our parents were brought up and that is the way our ancestors were too, and so forth for several centuries. This is all natural for us.

It is another matter that there are problems that have previously been left unattended. They have piled up and in some places have become sore ones. At the present time, within the framework of the processes, of democracy, freedom, and glasnost, they have come to the surface and are making themsevles felt. As you can see, we are reacting to them not only emotionally but also on a policy level. Sometimes it may be with some time lag, but you known, in policy too one must not lag behind. But making hasty moves is no less dangerous. One can cook pancakes that no one will swallow.

So, we have arrived through our new nationalities policy at an understanding of the fact that fundamental changes are needed in the federation. I think that what will occur in the next few months—and it will be precisely so because it is one of the points of this phase of cardinal changes that our society is going through—will all lead to the situation returning to normal and so on. I am confident, of course, that as in former times, regardless of all the trials and tribulations, both the Russian Federation and the people of Russia will perform a consolidating role. I am counting on this. I am convinced that this is how it will be. The inhabitants of Russia will not tolerate those who try to push them into confrontation with other people and into destroying the Union, wherever they might be, at the union level, at the republican level, or at the regional level. The second point, regarding the possibility of working with Comrade Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, since he has been elected Supreme Soviet chairman:

A democratic process is under way. That is the way the issue was solved, in a democratic manner, although with certain difficulties. I think—and I stressed this right away when I was asked after leaving the airplane in Canada—I think that this choice, albeit a difficult one, was made precisely because Comrade Yeltsin has made several very important political statements on large-scale issues of the policy of perstroyka at that moment. I think that if, as I have already said and would like to use this turn of phrase again because I like it, it suits the essence of the problem—if that was not a political game for simply obtaining the post, then this opens opportunities for normal work. After all, I could put my signature on many things Comrade Yeltsin said then, in the last days before his election, to those theses of his. If this is so, then everything else is not an obstacle.

The main thing is our common tasks and goals, the main thing is cooperation. Consolidation is particularly required now, and I will tell you—I think I have already told you—I would be the most upset and worried if at this stage of profound changes in our society a split among democratic forces, perestroyka forces, and all the healthy forces in society occurred. It is very important for us to have national concord now, a profound understanding of the need of what we have to solve in our work in these months to come.

[Voices are heard off the microphone, followed by a barely audible question in Russian]...(?In your view, is NATO reaching an understanding) on the need for a compromise decision on the question of the military and political status of a future Germany? How soon, in your view, can a consensus be reached on the creation of new all-European security structures?

[Thatcher] Thank you, I had your question conveyed here. The microphones were not working. NATO is always in favor of a compromise. How do we regard the consequences of the unification of Germany? First of all, Germany is being united in such a way that East Europe is uniting with West Europe, with West Germany. West Germany is one of the main parts of NATO and all Germany can choose its own alliances for itself. West Germany will continue to remain part of NATO and East Germany can too if it wants. [as heard] I think it is necessary for the whole alliance to meanwhile keep the presence of U.S. troops in Europe. The presence of troops is vitally necessary for the security of Europe and it is important for the United States and, I think, for the Soviet Union, that these troops stay in the meantime. I understand the need for some reassurance for the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries.

We are working now on how to devise these measures or a certain selection of measures that will provide this reassurance. Both the United States and we are working on these and I think this will cover a considerable number of questions. This, I think, shows that NATO recognizes the need to produce these reassurances and this in itself is a mark in the new chapter in relations which is taking shape between the two alliances.

Another thing I think both of us—I think even all of us—consider to be the best way of building relations between the United States and Canada and East Europe and the Soviet Union is through the framework of the all-European process. We support economic relations. We maintain our transatlantic relations through NATO and deal with the questions of defense taking into account the political transformation of NATO. A forum is needed for wider discussions which would make it possible to hold more regular meetings at the level of government heads. The all-European forum can take on this role and hold such discussions. I also think the foreign ministers could meet twice a year. Minister Shevardnadze has put forward a whole range of proposals in this area. First, NATO realizes that it must give the Soviet Union reassurances over the German unification process, and second, there must be a permanent, broader forum for discussion, so we can understand each other's points of view, in order to crystallize subjects so we can tackle these issues together.

[Correspondent in English, with superimposed Russian translation] A question from the newspaper MESSAGGERO for both the president and the prime minister. What opportunities exist for creating common or parallel NATO and Warsaw Pact bodies? And the next question is especially for you, Mrs Thatcher. Do you consider it possible to set up a common European security system, something more than simply a forum for conducting discussions?

[Thatcher] The second question was for me.

[Correspondent interrupts; his remarks are inaudible]

[Thatcher] At present I do not see any possibility of such common bodies emerging. Possibly sometime in the future. For the moment, the new spirit of relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, as witnessed by the NATO communique and also the Warsaw Pact communique, provides a groundwork, and we must also carry out this work within the framework of the pan-European Helsinki process. In other words, for the moment we must work making use of the existing organizations. This will produce the most rapid results and create greater trust. In the future something else might emerge, but let us now use the familiar structures already in existence.

Now to the question on the common—the single security system. Just now I do not see any possibility of the emergence of such a system for the reason that I gave when answering the first question. The point is that this is done not through arms limitation talks, but through discussions in the wider forum. The way discussions on issues relating to arms reductions and other matters are going—these are going on within the framework of the pan-European process, and as I have already said, this is the very forum which will help establish more active and closer relations between all the countries that have signed the Helsinki agreements.

[Gorbachev] The way I see it generally, these two questions are linked. It is logical to coordinate them, particularly in the context of what is happening in Europe and the world. I hold a different stance on the question of whether it is possible to create parallel organs of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. I believe that what happened yesterday in the Political Consultative Committee testifies to a profound change in the nature of this organization—this military-political organization, with the accent on the fact that it will be largely a political organization.

If NATO proceeds in the same direction—and this will be seen from its July meeting—then this opens up the opportunity for examining the issue not just from the viewpoint of some agreements on mutual interaction toward pan-European security, but naturally some institutions could be created. Therefore, I believe that, if what was said yesterday at the Political Consultative Committee results in a new, overhauled Warsaw Pact, and if NATO without maneuvering or taking steps merely for the sake of appearance—for that is now impossible since public opinion pays attention to the way in which an organization or a government acts, but we are now more confident that NATO will have an earnest conversation in July—anyway, if the processes of change proceed adequately in NATO, too, both doctrine, structure and so on, content, functions, again with the accent on it being more of a political organization, then we may well see the appearance of some appropriate institutions which will, in one way or another, reflect these changes. I think if this happens one can predict the process of setting up a pan-European security structure will accelerate, since, to a large degree, this is being done today, relying on these organizations. And if the nature and functions of these organizations are changed, and if there is, possibly, cooperation between them, this would speed up the process of creating a pan-European security structure. But Mrs. Thatcher is probably more cautious and experienced. She is not ruling this out, I think—this is how I understand her answer—but merely reserving for herself a more considered approach. I think this is also justified. If we were the same, and everything in our countries was the same, there would be no point in visits, dialogue, discussions—none of this would be necessary.

[Maslennikov] I think we have time for two final questions. Over to a representative of the French press, please.

[Correspondent in French, with superimposed Russian translation] I want to ask the following question. The economic reform plan submitted by the prime minister has been subjected to considerable criticism by all sectors in the Soviet Union. In particular, three republican parliaments have not adopted it. These are the parliaments of Russia, Belorussia, and the Ukraine. Do you not thing it abnormal, Mr. President, that in these conditions, the government can stay in office? It would perhaps be normal for the government to resign, as happens in all democratic countries?

[Gorbachev] I think what is taking place in our country shows we have already far surpassed you in terms of democracy, and here we have a confirmation of the fact that we have become very democratic. Now to turn to the essentials, however.

I think the about-face taking place in our country within the framework of the radical economic reform at the moment is perhaps the most important step in perestroyka. It is vital. The time is ripe for it. True, there are other opinions too. There are opinions such as the need to return to the command system and rigid centralism, and to manage things that way. These exist, too. All the same, the majority of society has long since come to accept the need for very profound changes in our economy. As early as 1987 at the party Central Committee plenum, we set ourselves the task, as the result of debates, of acting in the economic field in a way that would accumulate the prerequisites for switching to a market economy.

Even then it was clear that this was essential for it to be effective, for labor, material, and financial resources to be rationally used, for the creation of the necessary incentives for productive work, and to ensure the most efficient assessment of the results of labor, through the market, whether of a specific collective or an individual.

The market is not an invention of capitalism. Mrs. Thatcher and I recalled today that we may both have failed to become lawyers, but we did study jurisprudence and within that process we studied Roman law, and even then I noticed that Roman law contains norms regulating whatever relates to exchange and the market. These elements of the market, then, if not the market as a whole, in a form corresponding to the level of development of the society's productive forces, have existed for a long time. It is the invention of our civilization and it is natural that each phase in the development of human civilization has imposed its own specific features on market functions, institutions, and instruments, etc.

We also tried out direct bartering after the revolution, and then, even in Lenin's time, we rejected that and went for the New Economic Policy, the use of economic categories and methods of management and the introduction of stimuli. Lenin's formulation is well known. You cannot build socialism on enthusiasm alone. You can do it with the help of enthusiasm, but on material interest. In general, some sorts of tasks, even the most major and large tasks, can be solved on enthusiasm, but in some definite historical period. But stimuli, the stimulation of interests, are necessary to lay permanent foundations for the normal functioning of society.

Speaking of the market, strictly speaking it is the very milieu which is meant to stimulate highly productive and high-quality labor. Most important, the market will indicate where things are all right and where they are not, which needs are being met better and which are not, and, depending on that, capital will flow from one to the other, and so on.

I have gone a long way here, because it is indeed a big question. We have approached the need—an understanding that we need the market. But establishing a market is serious business. We have accumulated a certain amount of experience, by introducing financial autonomy, self-financing, leasing, contracting, improving planning by freeing it more and more from the practice of issuing directives, and by improving management bodies, primarily by giving more freedom to enterprises and less freedom to ministries, which is to say, based on the principle of the decentralization of rights and responsibilities. We have had to go through all that. Without it we lacked an understanding altogether of how to operate in market conditions. Even now we are not yet ready.

To speak—to a significant degree this reaction to the government's proposal is explained by society's psychological unreadiness—we have to discuss and understand everything, but the government submitted its proposal as it promised, for examination by the Supreme Soviet, and after examination by the Supreme Soviet, if it deems it necessary and makes some sort of adjustments, after all that, if it agrees, it will all be put forward for discussion by society.

Even now, since we are broadcasting and relaying everything that is going on here at the Supreme Soviet—I know that the British Parliament did not withstand live relays, they tried them and rejected them immediately, but we are still withstanding them, although we are also already receiving signs that it is perhaps time to get our legislators away from the television set, so that they are not under the constant influence of the screen and not working for the screen, but on substance instead [changes thought] though it must be said that the Supreme Soviet is growing and augmenting in competence with surprising speed. So there you are. Everyone heard the report, everyone heard it, but what did they hear most of all in it? There may well be, or are, some failings in the report, in its structure and presentation, because I noticed that people began talking about prices most of all. Yet it says there that to switch to the market under our conditions we will have to exert great efforts. First, there must be a sort of preparatory stage, during which we must adopt taxation legislation, which is now under debate. Those of you who go to the Supreme Soviet sittings have seen what fierce debates are under way. These are all fundamental issues, without which one cannot approach the market, as it were.

A decision on enterprises, on small and medium-sized enterprises, antimonopoly legislation, legislation is ready to be released and discussed. We have to adopt a decision, whether in the Supreme Soviet or in the government, on the creation of a developed finance and credit network, banks, commercial banks. The market cannot function without this. We must set up stock markets, commodity markets; we need all this too, places for the information to come together, for purchasers, producers and consumers to meet, as it were, and address these issues—in fact, that which should happen within the framework of a market, exchanges—all this has to be created as well.

In brief, I have mentioned perhaps only half of what we still have to resolve—a total package numbering over 30 laws and decisions that we must adopt to create an infrastructure for the market to function. Let's take our credit system, for instance. At the moment it doesn't work. Money costs nothing. The overall indicator for credit payments is 2.4 percent, and we sometimes have even 1.5 percent. What kind of a percentage is that? How is it going to provide an incentive for people to use credits quickly and obtain a yield from them? All this has to be reinterpreted. The market will not tolerate this. So a great deal will have to be done. On the whole we have a lot to do. This is first. Second, naturally questions will arise connected with reforming prices. I think at present no one here can make proper sense of prices. Some prices did not change despite all the changes, despite labor and resources becoming more expensive, despite higher costs. Still some prices have not changed since 1952, or since 1962, if one speaks about meat and milk. There were some changes, some adjustments, but they were insignificant. Thus everything has changed, become more expensive. Salaries have increased several times over. This means it all weighs heavily on the cost price.

Then a question arises: how does all this work? On subsidies. Subsidies on agricultural products alone have surpassed 100 billion rubles. Municipal services are receiving subsidies. The subway system is receiving subsidies. The beautiful Moscow subway which functions well and provides good service to people, it needs expenditures. It needs to be maintained. It needs repairs. It is unprofitable. It cannot work. It is also subsidized. As for the most important energy resources of the present time, without which no economy can function, those who produce these resources do not have a good and normal financial state. So wholesale prices need to be changed, both wholesale and purchase, and retail prices.

We have promised the people—I have said it more than once, you all can probably remember this—that when we come to the point where we all have to tackle this, we will hold consultations. So the consultations have begun. I think that when the Supreme Soviet comes to a final assessment and makes the adjustments it considers necessary to the governmental proposals, to its system of measures on the transition to the market, I think then this program will be submitted to public discussion as well. Then it will begin. We will find a formula for this discussion.

I personally think that this should be opinions of representative bodies and not simply several published statements by authors or reactions of a certain number of people. This we will evidently have to discuss at all levels of the soviets. Each republic as a result of these discussions at representative bodies—and we have just elected all the soviets—will have a clear understanding of the opinions. On the basis of this our position will be formulated.

I think that reactions from any quarter now are of an emotional nature. It is indeed a profound departure and it requires study and understanding. I think everything still lies ahead. That is how I regard this process. We must definitely come to an agreement in the country and embark, on the basis of consent, on these cardinal measures in order to solve these problems without dragging our heels, but at the same time protecting the people's living standards. I don't know.

I have been reading the Western press. You are present here and no doubt this material emanates from you. It says the standard of living—this was said in the British press—the standard of living in the Soviet Union will fall by 70 percent as a result of what the government has proposed. Where did they get that from? We are planning, apart from precious metals, expensive furs, and certain luxury items or a number of foods, to compensate for all the rest in full. An estimate shows that food, basic manufactured goods, and so on will all be compensated 100 percent. We only need to bring all prices into line with the realities of the economy and bring them close, incidentally, to world prices.

How can we open our market completely unprotected by anything to the Western markets? Representatives of business circles in Great Britain and their confederates would strip us bare in a fortnight. We must prepare ourselves from this viewpoint also. This is the most correct approach. To organizationally enter into the world economy it is necessary to embark on the application of those criteria and prices, world prices. We must then get down to the convertibility of the ruble. All this will take time. What no doubt worries our people in all this is, as I see it, two points: Will these prices affect the standard of living, especially that of the poorly provided for? The second thing is the market. It will require efficient work and a reduction in costs. Moreover, it will require a regrouping and some structural alterations. This means that people will be laid off. So, have they any protection? The first thing, the changes in prices, will this be compensated for or not? The second thing, how will the state provide for them when they are temporarily unemployed? They must train and acquire another profession. Or perhaps, quite simply, their enterprise needs to be refurbished, and the people must somehow be provided for, have a safeguard.

This whole system is being thought out very thoroughly. Of course the state must ensure social security. I believe that, when our people understand all the details, what is what, why it is necessary—for, after all, we have not embarked on the switch to a market economy merely out of curiosity, the point is that we need it! We can't sleep without a market! I believe we can't fall asleep because there's so little in the marketplace. That's why we can't sleep! So we need a market economy to create a powerful impetus and get people using their initiative, so that each person might have access to the products a normal market can provide. We have all we need to ensure a fully-fledged market, and we will overcome this task.

I believe that we in this country will reach an agreement with our people that we need this so we will eventually enter into a normal economic milieu and improve the conditions governing the provision and satisfaction of people's needs. This issue is so important and I see all of you are taking part in the discussions, because I get information about what you write in your newspapers.

Sometimes I read it and I am delighted at what you write. I wonder how you sniff out these details! Well, that is freedom of the press. You probably often—you retain the same thinking that has now appeared among our newspapermen, that's the only way to get people to read the newspapers—you have to concoct something, otherwise people won't read the newspapers. Well, probably that's the way you reason there. You are operating under financial autonomy there, too! [Gorbachev laughs] But all the same, don't forget that we are currently doing something very serious, and you must write about us in a serious vein. We need this, too. Just remember that you need perestroyka and the transfer here in this country just as much as we do!

This is the price that must be placed on what is happening here. The central point of world politics is here. Those who have not understood this have understood nothing of what is happening in the world. This is a statement of fact. It is not because I want to enhance our role here. No, it is reality, and I am very satisfied about the fact that Mrs. Thatcher said that what is happening in our country today is perhaps the most major event of the twentieth century. Thank you.

[Maslennikov] Respected Soviet and foreign colleagues, our time has unfortunately elapsed and in spite of the great interest, allow me, on your behalf, to thank President Gorbachev and Prime Minister Thatcher for coming here. Thank you all.

Thatcher Applauds 'Historic Changes'

LD0806164290 Moscow TASS in English 1622 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—Visiting British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher declared strong support for the changes and reforms, currently under way in the Soviet Union, at a news conference here today.

Thatcher characterised perestroyka as the process of "the most exciting, biggest historic changes that have taken place in Europe for very long time." She added that "when they succeed they will have taken the cause of freedom greatly forward."

Thatcher also said that the current visit to the Soviet Union took place immediately after the highly successful Washington summit, which moved "things on in the world at large to a new and greater understanding."

During here meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev this morning, the British prime minister said, "we had very interesting and deep, constructive friendly discussions." She described it as another chapter in the bilateral political dialogue which enabled to consider "the options in the way ahead."

Thatcher said the meeting focused on the external aspects of the unification of Germany and expressed the view that a unified Germany "should stay in NATO and has the right to choose its alliance."

"But we understand," she continued, "that the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact will require some reassurance to enable them to be certain of their own security. And we must find ways ahead to provide that assurance."

Thatcher also said she met Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov to discuss "home things" in the USSR and "a very interesting" one- hour conversation with Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov.

Gorbachev Appraises Talks

LD0806171390 Moscow TASS in English 1641 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—"I regard the meeting with Mrs. Thatcher within the context of the active political dialogue that has marked recent weeks and months," Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said in his opening remarks at a joint news conference here today.

British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher is on a working visit in the USSR.

Gorbachev said that his talks with Thatcher today lasted several hours. The point at issue, he observed, are contacts between the leaders of the two countries that are linked by longstanding traditions and cooperation.

The political dialogue between the leadership of the USSR and Britain "has attained a high level marked by great substance and effectiveness, which turns it into an important factor of European politics and world process".

The Soviet president and the British prime minister discussed what Gorbachev described as "major and topical problems of the day", focusing "on the assessment of the latest Soviet-American summit in Washington".

"The British prime minister and I attach great importance to what happened in the United States," Gorbachev said. "We both think of what is important not only for implementing the agreements reached there, but also for continuing the planned interaction and partnership."

Noting that during the meeting with Thatcher they discussed in detail the place of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO in the European process, and especially in conection with the German issue, including its external aspects, Gorbachev said:

"We see the possibility of shaping new relations between the two blocs in the course of their transformation in connection with progress in disarmament and the elimination of military confrontation in Europe."

On the basis of his conversation with Thatcher, Gorbachev drew the conclusion about "the possibility of interaction between these two military-political organisations in preparing new structures of all-European security".

Stressing that the two paid great attention to the German problem, Gorbachev said that he set out in detail Soivet "arguments and concerns".

Mrs. Thatcher reaffirmed that she understands the need to take the Soviet Opinion into account as fully as possible, he said.

"Central to my considerations is the idea that one should not limit oneself to one option alone, which will inevitably be lopsided," Gorbachev remarked.

"An intensive exchange, intensive search for and comparison of views and proposals are required in order to find the optimal option that would satisfy all and, which is especially important, would contribute to the development and consolidation of positive processes in Europe and the world at large."

Both sides reaffirmed the right of the Germans to live in one state, Gorbachev said. At the same time, he observed, the final summing-up of the results of the war is not up to the Germans alone. The "two-plus-four" mechanism should fully play its role, he added.

Gorbachev said that the British prime minister was interested in the current situation in the Soviet Union. "I appreciate Mrs. Thatcher's invariable interest in our perestroyka and her stance on this issue," Gorbachev said.

"I regard this interest not only as an expression of human solidarity with our people and country, but also as her profound understanding of the Soviet Union's role in today's world and the immense significance of what is happening in this vast country within the framework of its renewal for civilisation and universal peace."

Gorbachev on Market Economy

LD0806173690 Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich, Boris Zverev, and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—Addressing a news conference here today, President Mikhail Gorbachev pointed to the Soviet leadership's determination to switch the Soviet economy to operation in market conditions.

"We will overcome this task," said the president, replying to a question. Perestroyka in the USSR and the national economy's transition to a market "are a central point of world politics", he remarked.

"We need a market economy in order to create strong incentives and stimulate people's initiative," Gorbachev said, assessing the on-going process of radical economic reform as "the biggest step in perestroyka".

In his view, the controversy caused by Nikolay Ryzhkov's cabinet's plan of the transition to market economics is explained "by society's psychological unreadiness".

Thatcher, Gorbachev on Israel

LD0806182890 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich, Boris Zverev, and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—The Soviet Union and Britain said today that Israel should not settle Soviet immigrants on the occupied Arab territories. This statement was made by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher at a joint news conference here. The British premier is staying on a working visit in the USSR.

"I have said at the meeting of the Board of Jewish Deputies and in other speeches that I think it is wrong that people who leave the Soviet Union should be placed in the occupied territories, territories which we really regard as belonging to someone else and not to the state of Israel," Thatcher stressed.

"We should see that those people do not reside in the occupied territories which basically do not belong to the State of Israel. And we shall continue to make that view clear," she added.

At the same time the British premier noted that London did everything possible to secure the right of emigration from the USSR to Israel for a greater number of people. "President Gorbachev has given it," she said.

Thatcher said that some of the Arab countries had "blamed" President Gorbachev and she responded vigorously.

For his part, the Soviet president reaffirmed the position expressed in his statmeents on that score during the recent visit to the U.S. and stressed that "it is all very serious." Having expressed the hope that "they in Israel will heed what has been said" during his visit to Washington, where "everything is taken seriously."

According to Gorbachev, if Israel pays heed, "then in accordance with Soviet legislation, this process (emigration of Soviet Jews—TASS) can proceed as usual, normally."

"We will have no need to make adjustments," he added. "If the situation will develop so that one will have to respond, then, I must say, we will have to use our sovereign rights and our competence in order to exert influence."

Gorbachev on Cooperation With Yeltsin

LD0806192590 Moscow TASS in English 1858 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich, Boris Zverev, and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—"The Russian parliament has not taken any steps that contradict the Constitution of the Soviet Union. I am absolutely convinced, 100 per cent certain, that the Russian Supreme Soviet (parliament) will not approve any laws that damage the development of a new federation of republics," President Mikhail Gorbachev said at a joint news conference with visiting British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher here today.

Asked about the first decisions by the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, the president expressed confidence that "like before, during all turns and trials, the Russian Federation and the peoples of Russia will perform a consolidating role" and will not tolerate those who seek to promote confrontation among peoples and to split the Union.

"Through our policy—our new nationality policy—we got to understand that fundamental changes are needed in the federation," he said and expressed hope that developments in the next few months will lead to gradual normalization of the situation.

Speaking about the possibility of constructive cooperation with Boris Yeltsin, elected president of the Russian Federation, Gorbachev said he was ready to put his signature under many things Yeltsin had said during the days preceding his election.

"Given this, the rest is no hindrance," he noted. "We have common goals and tasks. The important thing is cooperation."

Gorbachev added that at this stage of deep changes in Soviet society he would be most upset and alarmed if a rift tore apart democratic, perestroyka forces, all healthy forces in society. "The important thing is to have a national consensus, a deep understanding of what we shall have to solve in the next few months," he stressed.

Gorbachev, Thatcher View Pact, NATO

LD0806194990 Moscow TASS in English 1924 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich, Boris Zverev, and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—Speaking at a joint news conference here today with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher favoured preserving U.S. troops in Europe at the current stage. She said the presence of American troops was vital for the security of Europe and added that it was also important for both the United States and the USSR.

Speaking about the military-political status of a future Germany, Thatcher noted that the question of its membership of any alliance is the matter of entire Germany. NATO understands that it is necessary to give assurances to the Soviet Union as regards the unification of Germany, she added.

On the possibility of creating common or parallel bodies of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, the prime minister said she could not see these common bodies emerging. She could neither see a single, common European system of security emerging at present.

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev expressed a different point of view. He said that yesterday's meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee testified to profound changes in the nature of this military-political organisation, with greater emphasis placed on the political side. If NATO undergoes similar changes, then it is possible that relevant institutes will emerge, reflecting in one way or another these changes.

"If this happens, then one can foresee that creation of a common European structure of security will move faster," the president said.

Replying to a question about the possible German membership of NATO, he said that discussions held at the recent Soviet-U.S. summit gave food for thought to both sides. Gorbachev pointed out that he retained "the same approach toward solving this problem" and added that a variant, taking account of the realities and the balance of interests, and stimulating positive processes in Europe should be found.

Speaking about the results of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, the Soviet leader stressed that the declaration taken on its results is "an absolutely new document." It contains an important thesis that the Warsaw Treaty member countries regard Western representatives not as enemies but as partners in fostering new relations in Europe.

Gorbachev's Dinner Speech

LD0806221190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1805 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Speech given by Mikhail Gorbachev at a dinner in honor of Margaret Thatcher, prime minister of Great Britain, on 8 June]

[Text] Moscow, 8 June (TASS)— We are pleased to see you again in Moscow. It is good that such meetings are becoming regular, working ones in the literal, and not just the diplomatic, meaning of the word. Each one provides something new and useful. And trust, openness, interest in each other's opinion and readiness for interaction are expanding. We cannot imagine present international relations without active Soviet-British cooperation. It can and must play its indispensable part at the present turning point in European and world history.

The visit to our country by the prime minister of Great Britain is the first meeting with a Western leader since the Soviet-Canadian and Soviet-American summit meetings.

The whole world knows that Great Britain is linked to the United States and Canada by special relations, the roots of which stretch back far into history. We know that you have received first-hand information on the course and results of the talks. And yet, I want to confirm once more our high evaluation of the meetings in Canada and the United States. This time it is identical in many respects on both sides.

Very recently, relations between the USSR and the United States were still a source of tension in the world. Now they are becoming a factor of international stability. Preconditions for transferring Soviet-American relations onto the tracks of cooperation based on partnership are developing. Orwell's anti-Utopia regarding permanent hostility in relations between great powers has not been vindicated.

During our North American meetings the firm supports were laid, I hope, for a giant bridge which will link the Soviet Union, the United States, and Canada across two oceans. There will be intensive two-way traffic over it, between the two extreme points of European civilization in the northern hemisphere. By joining them into a single circle we shall restore its normal blood circulation which has been artificially hampered by the vicissitudes of history. The results of the Soviet-American summit meetings are the property of the entire world community. It would have been inconceivable without the positive contribution of other powers.

We spoke of this yesterday at the session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact organization. I am able with satisfaction to note that an important accord has been achieved on profoundly transforming this international organization and giving it a political character. It would not be a bad thing if this process met with a positive reaction within NATO and it is desirable that it be synchronized on both sides.

The courses for transforming the military blocs into bodies for cooperation will not be simple, but it is necessary that they proceed along converging lines, and then the goal will be achieved. Then the elimination of military confrontation will fit in organically with the general positive process. Then we may make a smooth transition to new structures of all-European security. We were interested to hear of the proposals that you, Mrs. Thatcher, made on this issue at the conference in Cambridge, much of which links up with our approaches.

Europe is in a period of profound changes. The concepts of single legal, economic, cultural and information entities are being filled with content.

The German problem and its external aspects have now moved to the center of European politics. To be honest with oneself and others, one has to admit that to date a solution to the future of Germany which suits all peoples has not been found. Therefore, we need to search further; we have to work together on options and discuss all the arguments attentively. And we invite this to be done without delay. We are living in a very dynamic period, which is dictating its own pace in international politics. At the same time, we must not permit any distortion in the position of the new German state, for then the pan-European system will be deprived of the historically-conditioned balance of the interests of all states, and the "common European home" will not receive a reliable foundation.

Our allies in the anti-Hitler coalition should understand the Soviet people's sensitivity regarding a solution of the German problem. It made incredible sacrifices at the altar of our common victory, and it is morally entitled to a just and final summing up of the results of World War II. Assurances alone, even if they are very authoritative, of the good intentions of those who insistently and unequivocally want to include Germany in NATO are insufficient. That will convince and reassure none of us. Nor will it remove the anxiety or even the suspicions. There is a need to really guarantee the non-disruption of strategic stability in the continent. Such guarantees can be found only in a close linkage of the unification of Germany with the all-European process.

We are pleased that perestroyka has not only inaugurated an era of renewal in our country but has also become a catalyst for major, positive, changes in world development. This, as I am aware, Mrs. Thatcher, is also, to a great extent, the basis for your invariable support for the transformations in the USSR.

We now distinctly feel that perestroyka belongs not just to us but also the peoples of Europe. We value the attitude of all those who sincerely support our efforts and wish to help in the realization of our plans. The rapt attention being paid to the reforming of Soviet society is an indicator of the increasing integration and mutual dependence of all parts of Europe and the world. The restructuring process in our country has now reached a peak of intensity. It is proving very hard for everyone. You are, of course, well acquainted with this feeling, inasmuch as your country quite recently also went through reforms of the existing structures, although it was indeed in connection with a different situation and different methods.

We consider that the guarantee of success for such a vast undertaking as our perestroyka is public concord and the democratic consolidation of all the diverse and contradictory forces that are concerned for the fate of their country and their great people and state. I am confident that the Soviet people will have sufficient resolve, common sense, and intellectual strength to implement its choice.

Tomorrow you will go to Kiev where the "Days of Britain" in the USSR have begun. Your participation, Mrs. Thatcher, in this very major action in the history of our relations will impart a special significance to it. I wish success to the "Days of Great Britain" in the Soviet Union and hope that they will give the Soviet people the opportunity to become more closely acquainted with your country, a country with a very rich history and culture, and with its very outstanding achievements. I do not doubt that this will well serve the strengthening of mutual understanding, trust and cooperation between the peoples of the USSR and Great Britain.

Then you will visit Leninakan. We evaluate highly this humane, charitable act of your's in relation to the Armenian people who experienced such a misfortune—the terrible earthquake which brought so many victims. This is also a lofty symbol of the relations between our countries and peoples.

To the development and flourishing of Soviet-British relations, to the health of Mrs. Margaret Thatcher and Mr. Denis Thatcher.

Further on Gorbachev Speech

LD0806175390 Moscow TASS in English 1746 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—"We cannot imagine present-day international relations without active Soviet-British cooperation. It can and should play its indispensable role at the turning point in European and world history," Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev said at a dinner in honour of the British prime minister, Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, here today.

"The visit by the prime minister of Great Britain to our country is the first meeting with a Western leader after the Soviet-Canadian and Soviet-American summit meetings," Gorbachev said.

"Until recently, relations between the USSR and the United States were a source of tension in the world. At present, they are becoming a factor of international stability.

"Conditions are being created for the transition of Soviet-American relations to cooperation on the basis of partnership.

"Orwell's anti-utopia about the state of permanent hostility between super powers has proved to be wrong."

"The results of the Soviet-American summits belong to the entire international community," Gorbachev said. "This accomplishment would be unthinkable without a positive contribution from other powers."

Dwelling on the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee's session on Thursday, Gorbachev said that "an important understanding was reached to transform profoundly this international organisation and impart to it a political character".

"It would be good if the process evoked a positive response in NATO and was synchronised by the sides," he said.

"The German problem and its external aspects have moved to the foreground of European politics," Gorbachev said. "Today, no solution has yet been found that would suit all peoples."

The President said that "further search is required, it is necessary to work jointly on options and thoroughly study all arguments" in order to resolve this complicated problem.

"We live at a very dynamic time," Gorbachev remarked. "This time dictates its own pace of international politics. No imbalance should be allowed in the status of a new German state, since the all- European system will lose the historically established balance of interests of all states, and the all-European home will not have a solid foundation."

He emphasised the "real guarantees of non-disruption of strategic stability in Europe are required, and they can only be found in the close interconnection between German unification and the all-European process".

Speaking of days of Britain in the USSR, Gorbachev expressed the hope that the festival will enable Soviet people to know more about that country with rich history and culture and its oustanding accomplishments.

"The festival will serve well the consolidation of mutual understanding, confidence and cooperation between the peoples of the USSR and Britain," Gorbachev stressed in conclusion.

Gorbachev Discusses German Unity

LD0906114190 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1115 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By Chris Moncrieff, in Kiev, and James Hardy, PRESS ASSOCIATION political staff]

[Text] President Gorbachev has privately warned Mrs. Thatcher of Soviet fears should a united Germany remain within NATO, it was disclosed today. The Soviet leader made the remarks during a private dinner with Mrs. Thatcher at the Kremlin last night at the end of the first full day of her hectic three-day visit to the Soviet Union. Mrs. Thatcher later acknowledged Soviet fears and said the West was working towards offering firm assurances on security. But she insisted there could be no concessions on a unified Germany being a full member of the alliance or on the need for American troops to remain stationed on German soil. She also called on the West Germans to accept air-launched nuclear missiles as part of their commitment to NATO, a move likely to meet some opposition in the Federal Republic.

Mr. Gorbachev has several times expressed his concern about the new Germany becoming part of NATO, but it seems he will not be able to stop that happening. He said last night: "A solution acceptable to us has yet to be found. Our allies in the anti-Nazi coalition should be aware of the Soviet people's sensitivity to such a resolution of the German problem. However authoritative they appear, no amount of assurances or good intentions from those who insist bluntly on German incorporation into NATO will suffice. Nobody will feel convinced or relieved, no concerns or even suspicions will be allayed. Real guarantees are needed to keep European strategic stability intact. Perestroyka has reached a peak. It is not exactly plain sailing for us. I think you, Mrs. Thatcher, know the feeling."

Mrs. Thatcher said in a BBC radio interview last night that U.S. troops must stay in Germany. "That is also an assurance for the Soviet Union as well as NATO," she said. But she recognised Soviet apprehension and said further assurances would be offered. She added: "Precisely what those will be we have not quite worked out, but we are working at it."

It is clear that the two sides are still some way apart and Mr. Gorbachev's message was clearly directed to the forthcoming NATO summit in London.

Soviet unease is unlikely to be diminished by Mrs. Thatcher's call, in the same interview, for the West Germans to accept air- launched missiles as a replacement for the land-based Lance short- range missiles, which the United States has decided not to update. She said: "I hope that they will value the security of 45 years which has guarded their freedom in the past, brought them through successfully to democracy, freedom and justice. I hope they will have enough regard for the nations who have helped them to acheive that to carry on with a similar formula into the future."

Despite his misgivings, it is reported that after the dinner Mr. Gorbachev left the hall arm in arm with the prime minister—something he has never done before.

Thatcher's Dinner Speech

PM1106102390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS account of speech delivered by British Prime Minister M. Thatcher at dinner given by President M.S. Gorbachev in her honor in Moscow 8 June under the general heading: "For the Flourishing of Soviet-British Relations"]

[Text] Mr. President, Mrs. Gorbachev, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen!

First, let me thank you for your invitation to visit the Soviet Union, and also for the time and attention you have kindly devoted to this despite the fact that you have only just returned from Canada and the United States. I am looking forward to my trip to Kiev tomorrow, where we will attend the British festival and visit a trade and industry exhibition—the first on this scale in the Soviet Union. Then on Sunday I will go to Leninakan to take part in a ceremony opening a new school, the construction of which was a way for Britain to help in creating a better future for Armenian children following the dreadful earthquake in 1988.

Secondly, I would like to congratulate you and President Bush wholeheartedly on the results of your summit meeting in Washington. The hopes of many peoples of the world are pinned on meetings on this kind and I believe that the successes you have achieved will satisfy everyone, including the Soviet people. The accords secured in Washington clearly contribute to the strengthening of trust and stability at international level and will enable you to focus your attention on the transformations that are designed to promote greater prosperity and improve life in your country. We will continue to offer you our total support and trust as you perform this historic task.

I well remember how you gave us explanations on this subject when you spoke at the Guildhall last year in London. You said then: "We are building an open, democratic, and free society which has drawn lessons from the past, a society based on law and responsibility, a society which keeps its citizens well-informed and relies on their initiative and enterprise."

The new revolution in the Soviet Union reaches further than any of us—perhaps even you—thought. Definite efforts are still needed in the West in order to grasp its scope. Your country has embarked on a new historic path towards the future which envisages:

New constitutional relations between the republics and the central government founded on accord;

A new political structure founded on multiparty democracy;

And a new economic policy founded on market relations.

Each of these changes may be considered tremendous, particularly given the legacy you inherited from the past. Taken together, they are really remarkable. People's memory is so short that there is a tendency to accept these changes as our due and to underestimate the tremendous effort put into this. Allow me to assure you that that is not our opinion and that we recognize how much you have achieved.

But I also remember saying during a conversation with you here three years ago that the difficulties which inevitably accompany a process of such great change will be experienced for a long time yet before the fruits appear. Success can only be achieved by changing one's approach to things and dislodging outmoded views. Moreover, no politician in any country can honestly promise the people more than the people themselves can create or achieve through their own efforts. A government does not, after all, produce output or services: It is the people who do that.

From my previous visits to your country I remember your people saying how they suffered during the war—the Leningrad blockade, the battle for Stalingrad, the casualties, the tragedies. We in Britain have our own memories of that time. I remember how we longed for the day when peace would come. We wanted to build a new world mindful of the experience of the past. We thought that there would be no limit to our achievements.

Now we are living in peace and, whatever problems face us, they will be insignificant in comparison with the cares and sacrifices we experienced during and after the war. There was no magic then, only, as the greatest Briton said, "Blood, toil, tears, and sweat." There is no room for weakness now: only work, determination, and persistence. The difficulties do not lie in economic problems, which are soluble in time, but in whether one has the heart to succeed. It is interesting, you know, how many well-wishers you have throughout the world who want your efforts and those of your people to culminate in success.

You have also boldly taken up the challenge of the time in deciding to give the republics greater powers and establish new relations between them, with greater consideration for the strong national traditions in each republic; the history is extraordinarily complex—I read some of it before my trip here—and it reminds us of the tremendous number of different peoples within the Soviet Union and of the disturbances that have characterized Central and East Europe over the centuries.

As you know, Britain never legally recognized the Baltic states' incorporation into the Soviet Union. We always backed their self-determination. As I understand it, the Soviet Union also cleaves to this principle. Thus, there are no differences of approach in principle, so the practical problems arising at present in connection with the situation in the Baltic republics can indeed be resolved by means of talks. This may take some time, because all the details have to be studied carefully. But if there is the will—good will—a solution will follow.

Mr. President, just as at your meeting with President Bush, there is a most important international question on the agenda now—the consequences of German unification. The Soviet Union is entitled, as no other country, to be sure—doubly sure—about the future of Germany. I want to remind you that Mr. Shevardnadze recently said that war must never again come from German soil. We all want to be sure of that, including the German people. The best guarantee that we can have is the fact that Germany is choosing to unite within the framework of freedom, democracy, and legality...

They also want to retain their full membership of NATO. That is understandable: NATO has guaranteed their freedom for more than 40 years now and guarantees the broader framework of stability in Europe which helps Germany to flourish materially. They are also entitled, according to the First Principle of the Helsinki Final Act, signed by both your country and mine, to choose alliances for themselves.

No one will argue that provision will have to be made for definite steps that take the Soviet Union's special concern for its security into consideration. But I believe that we must also look at this from the viewpoint of the broader perspective of the future of Europe—a future based not on a rigid division into blocs but on the desire to constantly extend the framework of freedom and democracy. Of course, we all want to guarantee our security: No other country understands this better than the Soviet Union, which is illustrated by the tremendous military might that you have at your disposal and that you intend to keep. None of us knows where the new threat may come from.

But let us consider the prospects. We are conducting talks on cuts in armed forces and we hope to secure a conventional arms agreement before the end of the year. There is also great hope that this will be followed by further talks on both conventional and nuclear arms. NATO is reviewing its strategy and is placing greater emphasis on its political role in the new, less threatening situation in Europe.

All this indicates the importance of the changes that are taking place and how far we have come from the atmosphere of fear, suspicion, and confrontation to which we had become accustomed.

We must all now strive to deepen the all-European process within the framework of the CSCE, all 35 parties to which—the United States and your country included—are jointly discussing the problems of European security and Europe's future. Mr. Shevardnadze made some definite, important proposals on this subject and I have also put forward my own proposals. The decision must be taken at the meeting of the CSCE heads of state at the end of this year. At the same time the EC is signing more and more accords on trade and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and the countries of East Europe, and our daily life is thus becoming increasingly closely interconnected.

Considering German membership of NATO in this broader context, one can see that this is part of the peaceful rapprochement of the countries of Europe. I believe that this will strengthen stability and will be the best guarantee for both our countries that there will be no repetition of the tragedies and horrors of the past.

Mr. President, the present time is one of great and positive changes—in your country, in relations between our two countries, in Europe as a whole, and in the rest of the world. You have made a tremendous contribution to this, owing to your personal courage, perspicacity, and skillful leadership. Accept our best wishes and support in the very great transformations on which you have embarked. I raise my glass to you, to the success of your policy, and to the Soviet people's happiness and prosperity.

Leaders Attend Dinner for Thatcher

LD0806210690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A dinner was given today in honor of Margaret Thatcher on behalf of the USSR president. On the Soviet side were Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and his wife, Comrades Ryzhkov, Shevardnadze, Lukyanov, Primakov, and Yazov, members of the USSR Presidential Council and other officials. Also present were Margaret Thatcher and her husband, and the British officials accompanying her on her trip.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher exchanged speeches, the texts of which will be published in the press.

Thatcher on Gorbachev's 'Survival'

LD0806210290 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 2022 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By Chris Moncrieff, in Moscow, and James Hardy, PRESS ASSOCIATION political staff]

[Text] Mrs. Thatcher predicted tonight that President Gorbachev would survive as Soviet leader—and win through with his massive package of reforms.

She also said she believed the Soviet Union was coming to terms with a united Germany being a full member of NATO.

Mrs. Thatcher gave her opinions in a series of television and radio interviews at the end of the first full day of her exhausting three-day visit to the Soviet Union.

She spoke out about Mr. Gorbachev's leadership amid growing speculation that his position is becoming less secure because of economic problems, unrest in some republics, and his arch-rival Boris Yeltsin's election as president of the Russian Federation.

Mrs. Thatcher said his survival was very important, both for the Soviet Union and for the West.

"He is the one who has had both the vision and courage—courage to see what was wrong, vision to put it right, and the determination to see it through.

"It is vital that the man who started this off manages to see it right through."

She added: "I think they are on top of it. They know the enormity of the problems they still have to face. But they have only been in about five years.

"To change people's attitudes from waiting to be told what to do before they do it to being people who take their own initiatives cannot be achieved in five years, possibly not in 10.

"But I have no doubt that he will survive, and this his policies will succeed. He was the author of this new method and it required courage, vision and perseverance. He has got all three."

The prime minister said she was optimistic. "What they are doing is about the biggest thing that has been done in the world this half-century."

On NATO. Mrs. Thatcher said she could understand Soviet apprehension and the West needed to offer further assurances.

"They accept the unification of Germany will take place. I don't think they fully accept the NATO consequences of unification yet," she said.

"One has pointed out that East Germany is joining West Germany and West Germany is already a part of NATO.

"And therefore if follows that Germany as a whole wil be in NATO and it is absolutely vital for us all that American troops stay in Europe and the only place for them to stay, apart from Britain, is in Germany.

"I think they accept that argument, but the fact is that they are still apprehensive ... not surprisingly—they lost 27 million people dead in that war."

She dismissed the Soviet idea of dissolving both NATO and the Warsaw Pact and forming a new European association.

"I don't believe that it is realistic at the moment. I believe in working with what we have at the moment and taking it a step further so the position evolves. In 20 years time, I don't know what the position will be, but at the moment we have a very good working organisation."

Praises Perestroyka, Gorbachev

LD0906092790 Moscow TASS in English 0734 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Sidorov]

[Text] London June 9 TASS—British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher welcomed Soviet perestroyka carried out by President Gorbachev. Answering questions from the ITN [Independent Television News] television company after talks she held in Moscow, she stressed that the Soviet president is a political figure having a keen insight and realising his specific aims.

Gorbachev forwarded new thinking and this demanded shrewdness, conviction and political courage. Thatcher said the Soviet president has all qualities necessary for a state leader.

The prime minister stressed that the Soviet president is trying to reform the current centralised and strictly controlled economy into a free economic system, which will give people incentives to move forward and the feeling of responsibility for progress. If he manages to do so, this will be the greatest achievement in the past 50 years, she said.

Thatcher said Britain is ready to render the Soviet Union all the needed assistance to achieve its goals.

Thatcher said the Soviet Union's concern over German unification is natural as it lost millions of people during World War II. Admitting the need to concede additional guarantees of national security to the Soviet Union, the prime minister persisted in maintaining NATO and the U.S. military presence in West Europe.

Gorbachev-Thatcher Talks Reviewed

LD0806203190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As you know, Margaret Thatcher, the prime minister of Great Britain, is on a working visit to our country. She is here in connection with an important event in the history of Soviet-British relations—the Days of Great Britain in the USSR. Today the head of the British Government was received by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

The USSR president briefed Margaret Thatcher on his visits to Canada and the United States. They both rated highly the significance of the talks held there. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev recalled his two principles: there is no such thing as unequal security, and nothing in the world will go well unless there is cooperation and mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States. A U.S. military presence in West Europe would therefore also be expedient for a certain period, though it is totally unconvincing to link this with a united Germany being part of NATO.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke about the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact. He and Margaret Thatcher acknowledged with satisfaction the new nature of this conference and the fundamental significance of the declared intention of those taking part to transform the Warsaw Pact organization in keeping with the new circumstances. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted that the Warsaw Pact members are now entitled to expect a commensurate reaction from NATO, from the forthcoming NATO council in London.

Much attention was given to the German problem, to the external aspects of German unification. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that any unequivocal policy of NATO membership for the future Germany is unacceptable. The German question is too important and complex and has to be approached in an unorthodox way. And there is no need to be afraid here that this or that option might appear unfeasible at first sight. In the search for a solution one must take into account several interlinked processes now under way in Europe, and there will be an inevitable transition period, during which jointly and through the "two-plus-four" mechanism and with appropriate participation by all states concerned one can arrive at a solution which satisfies both Germany and the whole of Europe and which promotes the formation not only of a common European economic, legal, cultural, and information space, but also of a common security space.

As far as the Vienna talks are concerned, both leaders proceed from the view that an agreement on conventional arms and armed forces in Europe can and should be signed this year at the all-European summit conference, given, of course—Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted—the favorable development and settlement of the external aspects of German unification.

As is now already customary in relations between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher, perestroyka is a constant topic in their exchange of views. Great attention was devoted to it on this occasion too, especially to the newly begun tackling of its fundamental tasks.

Margaret Thatcher took an interest in the Lithuanian problem and in the situation in the Baltic republics as a whole, revealing a good knowledge of historical and contemporary circumstances. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev disclosed to her just how complex and contradictory the problem is and set out his well-known approach of acting within the framework of the constitution and legality in the spirit of perestroyka.

The report on the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher will be published in full in the press. [Video shows Thatcher and Gorbachev in discussion, surrounded by photographers]

TASS Reviews Meetings

LD0806200190 Moscow TASS in English 1922 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev's meetings with Margaret Thatcher have become an indispenable and important element of modern world politics. The meeting on June 8 was a special one: First, the British prime minister came to the Soviet Union on the occasion of a memorable event in the history of Soviet-British relations—the days of Britain in the USSR, and, second, it was held at a very important period of world development.

The Soviet president told Mrs. Thatcher about his visits to Canada and the United States. They both pointed to the importance of the talks held there, and not only of their results, but also of the cooperation potential formed in the process, which is so necessary today for a positive development of Europe and the world.

President Gorbachev recalled his two principles: There can be no security if it is not equal for all, and nothing in the world will develop in a proper way without Soviet-American cooperation and mutual understanding. This is why U.S. military presence in Western Europe is expedient for some time, although its linking with United Germany's membership in NATO is not quite convincing.

The Soviet president told Mrs. Thatcher about the recent meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee. They stated with satisfaction a new character of the meeting and the principled importance of the intention, announced by its participants, to bring the Warsaw Treaty Organization into line with new conditions. Gorbachev pointed out that now Warsaw Treaty member states have every reason to expect reciprocal steps from NATO, from the forthcoming NATO Council in London. The two alliances in the process of transformation, could organise cooperation and play a positive role in working out new structures of all-European security.

During the conversation much attention was devoted to the German problem and external aspects of reunification. Gorbachev said that it was unacceptable to see the future German state only as a NATO member, especially in view of the fact that no one knows the opinion of the German nation on this subject. The West German Government cannot speak on behalf of the whole of the future sovereign Germany. He expressed some ideas taking into account the interests of all countries.

The German problem is too important and complicated. It requires an original approach. One should not be afraid that, at first sight, this or that way to settle it might seem unrealistic. The experience of recent years showed that the ideas that seemed a utopia turned into real processes several years later. Gorbachev believes that it is possible to find a way that would not undermine processes that began in Europe recently. Something great has begun, which will determine the development of events throughout the world.

When looking for a solution, one should take into account several interdependent processes developing in Europe. Besides, a transition period is unavoidable, in the course of which it would be possible to work out a solution acceptable both for Germany and for the whole of Europe, using the "two-plus-four" mechanism and ensuring the participation of all parties concerned. This solution could promote the formation of a single European economic, legal, cultural and information space, as well as a single security space.

So far as the Vienna talks are concerned, both leaders proceed from the assumption that the agreement on conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe can and should be signed this year at the all-European summit, of course, if external aspects of the German problem are settled in a favourable way, Gorbachev pointed out.

It became customary for President Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher to discuss perestroyka during their meetings. This time they also focused their attention on this subject, especially on the solution of its fundamental problems.

Mrs. Thatcher asked Gorbachev about the Lithuanian problem and the situation in the Baltic region in general. She displayed good knowledge of the historical and modern aspects of the problem. Gorbachev told her about its complexity and contradictory nature and set forth his well-known approach: It is necessary to act in accordance with the Constitution and the law, in the spirit of perestroyka.

Thatcher, Ryzhkov Discuss Reforms

LD0806191690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Text] Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov met with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in the Kremlin today.

During an open and informal exchange of views they focused their attention on the comparison of the two countries' experience in tackling complicated problems dealing with political and economic developments in society.

The British prime minister showed a lively interest in pressing problems facing Soviet economy today and expressed high appreciation of the consistency displayed by the Soviet leadership in implementing the transformations.

Ryzhkov told her about the Soviet Government's understanding of possible ways to the radical restructuring of Soviet economy, which should give a strong and lasting impetus to economic activities on various levels. These approaches reflect a real situation in the country and the need for ensuring social protection of the population during the formation of an effective economic system. All this is being included into a program of the transfer to a regulated market economy and fundamental economic reforms.

It was also pointed out that favorable conditions created by joint efforts of the two countries in a political sphere promote their broader cooperation in other spheres, including economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, as well as the training of the managerial personal.

The conversation, which took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, was attended by A.P. Biryukova, N.P. Laverov, and S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister; L.M. Zamyatin, USSR ambassador to Britain; and R. Braithwaite, British ambassador to the USSR.

Departs Moscow for Kiev

LD0906061990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0600 GMT 9 May 90

[Text] Moscow, 9 June (TASS)—British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher left Moscow today for Kiev. She is on a working visit to the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

At Vnukovo Airport, where the state flags of Great Britain and the USSR were hoisted, she was seen off by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, and other officials.

Nikolay Laverov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Soviet ambassador to Britain, Leonid Zamyatin, and the British ambassador to the USSR, R. Braithwaite, who are accompanying M. Thatcher on her tour, left with her.

Signs Joint Gas Industry Agreement

LD0906104390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0734 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Margaret Thatcher, British prime minister, who arrived in Kiev today in connection with Days of Great Britain in the USSR, has visited exhibitions illustrating modern industry and life in her country. She took part in the ceremony of signing an agreement on setting up a joint Soviet-British firm for building a gas-chemical complex in Novyy Urengoy in western Siberia.

Meets With Defense Minister

PM0906225390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

["Our Correspondent" report: "Meeting at USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Text] British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who is paying a working visit to the Soviet Union, has met with Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

A conversation took place on problems that have taken center stage today in world and European affairs. Particular attention was devoted to the foreign political aspects of German unification.

The great significance of the accords secured during the recent Washington summit between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush for resolving disarmament problems and guaranteeing international security was noted.

The following took part in the meeting on the Soviet side: Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister; Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Forces and USSR deputy defense minister; Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy and USSR deputy defense minister; and L.M. Zamyatin, USSR ambassador to Britain. R. Braithwaite, British ambassador to the USSR, took part in the meeting on the British side.

The meeting took place in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere.

Gorbachev Greeting to British Festival

PM0606112790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Undated M. Gorbachev message: "To the Participants in the 'British Days' in the Soviet Union"]

[Text] I cordially greet the participants in the "British Days" in the Soviet Union, as Kiev welcomes them with hospitality.

This event, the largest in scale and complexity in the history of Soviet-British relations, symbolizes the new level of mutual understanding and cooperation which our two countries have reached in recent years as a result of persistent joint efforts and the display of goodwill. The new political thinking, reinforced by constructive and creative activity from both sides, opens up prospects for relations of partnership and friendship between the USSR and Britain. I am convinced that progress in this direction would be in the national interests of our two states and would serve the cause of strengthening European and worldwide security.

I express the hope that the "British Days" in the Soviet Union will enable new possibilities to be found for Soviet-British cooperation in various spheres and mutual understanding between our countries' peoples to be expanded.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev.

Shmelev Comments on Visit

LD0706160190 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 7 Jun 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow June 7 TASS—British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher is arriving on a working visit in Moscow tonight. Soviet-British relations have never been as good as they are today. A significant boost was given to contacts at both official and unofficial levels.

Dialogue between the leaders of the two countries has recently become rather close and dynamic, while the sphere of common or close attitudes of the two countries on many global and common European problems has significantly expanded. This hardly needs explaining: Britain's role in Europe, the world, its high responsibility, along with other great powers, for the fate of stability and world peace are well known. Common sense always prevailed in Britain, and the sensible position of its leaders on such sensitive issues as internal problems in other states cannot but cause respect. The Soviet Union receives with approval the British Government's statements on support for radical reform in Soviet society, for changes when suspicion and mistrust are replaced with openness and mutual trust in relationship not only between the two countries, but in the world on the whole.

This year in the development of bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and Britain can be rightfully called "the year of Britain." It was begun by the visit into the Soviet Union by Princess Anne, the first official visit to the USSR by a member of the British royal family. The institute of royal authority in Britain is the symbol and linchpin of the British mode of life, an ancient and highly revered tradition, which the Soviet Union holds in high esteem. Princess Anne took part in the inauguration of the Days of Britain in Kiev—an unprecedented event in the history of political, economic and cultural links of the two states.

As usually, the schedule of Thatcher's working visit is packed. Her talks with President Mikhail Gorbachev are the highlight of the visit. The two leaders established rapport already at their first meeting in 1984. There is no doubt that such relationship has great significance for the fate of the peoples.

The programme of the prime minister's visit also includes talks with Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov, signing joint Soviet-British documents and a meeting with Moscow-based journalists at a joint news conference with the Soviet president.

Thatcher is also expected to travel to Kiev to attend the British exhibition and Leninakan where she will inaugurate a school. The school was built by British workers and is a gift from the British Government to the Armenian people, who suffered in an earthquake.

Thatcher's visit will last until June 10 and will undoubtedly give fresh impetus to further development of bilateral links and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Britain in all fields.

Improved Relations To Help Unify Europe

LD0706190190 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] Mrs. Margaret Thatcher told newsmen before arriving in Moscow on Thursday that British-Soviet relations were better than ever. Indeed, after several decades of tension and open mistrust, political contacts between the two countries are growing. And more in this commentary by Mikhail Mayorov.

Margaret Thatcher is the first Western leader whom Mikhail Gorbachev meets after his visit to the United States. This in itself is sufficient to state that London is a major target of Soviet diplomacy in Europe. Britain too seems to be seeking stable and regular contacts with a leader whom Mrs. Thatcher described back in 1984 as a man to deal with. The British prime minister has no doubts as to the process of reforms taking place in the Soviet Union under Mr. Gorbachev's guidance. London supports perestroyka in the USSR, and if Soviet-British relations are free from suspicion at last, it should be attributed to the achievements of the policy of perestroyka and glasnost.

The personal factor too should be taken into consideration. Two big politicians Mikhail Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher are sitting down at the negotiating table regarding each other as a party to a frank dialogue rather than a difficult opponent. True, there are issues on which Moscow and London have failed to reach agreement. They have yet to decide whether nuclear weapons should be fully removed from Europe, or if they should be praised for their ability to keep war away from the European continent up till now.

Another two difficult problems are Germany's proposed affiliation to NATO and the situation in and around the Baltic region. But then the high level of trust achieved by the two countries may help them find mutually acceptable options, particularly following a series of talks at foreign and defense minister levels. Princess Anne has returned from Kiev, where British Days in the USSR are being held. A single Europe is still a target to be achieved by international politicians. Some are obviously viewing the idea as too abstract. But the steadily improving Soviet-British relations are a specific and tangible fact, (?from) a reality which is expected to replace the divided Europe of today.

Supreme Soviet Session

Moscow TV Reports 8 Jun Supreme Soviet Session

LD0906001290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2215 GMT on 8 June begins carrying an edited recording of the 8 June USSR Supreme Soviet session from the Kremlin. Anatoliy Lukyanov chairs the session. Reception is good.

The deputies begin discussing putting forward their views on various aspects of the draft media law. Various proposals are put forward, some are voted on but not adopted. Discussion centers for a time on what monopolization means in the context of a media law.

Article 10 of the media law is also discussed; it states that publications of less than 1,000 copies do not need to be registered.

The deputies then move on to discussing the draft law on labor, including the introduction of amendments and addenda. Lukyanov proposes the draft law be adopted in its first reading, given to labor collectives for discussion, before being further worked on by the Supreme Soviet. A member of the commission for labor describes the basis of this draft law. Deputies then ask various questions in regard to the law.

Deputy Grib from the commission for labor says it favors the draft law being adopted in its first reading, while noting one or two points with which the commission does not agree.

A vote is then taken on the proposal to adopt the draft law in its first reading: 340 vote in favor one votes against, and six abstain. The draft law is adopted.

The evening session begins with information from Lukyanov on the situation in Kirghizia: He notes there have been deaths and injuries and that measures are being undertaken to restore order there, without giving any detail. A proposal has been made that a message be sent to Kirghizia. Lukyanov reads the text of the proposed message. No indication is given of whether this proposal was adopted and the message sent.

The deputies then return to the draft law on the media, discussions centered on the role of the correspondent including whether he has the right to refuse to go against his own convictions in his work.

Further voting was abandoned as there was no quorum.

At 2333 GMT the recording end.

Supreme Soviet Completes Debate on Media Bill

LD0806192790 Moscow TASS in English 1821 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Andrey Orlov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 8 TASS—The Soviet parliament has completed the debate concerning the second reading of the bill on the press and other mass media. The bill was approved on the whole, but parliament declared additional editing [of] two articles was needed. This is why it was decided to finalize the new law on Tuesday, June 12.

Debates were particularly heated when dealing with the provision granting every Soviet citizen at the age of 18 [the right] to found a mass information organisation. Many deputies expressed concern that shadow economy dealers might seize control over the press. However, another viewpoint prevailed: The right to launch an information organisation is one of the most important democratic freedoms recorded in international human rights agreements signed by the Soviet Union.

The parliament also approved the first reading of amendments to the fundamentals of legislation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and union republics on labour. They concern the abolition of the lists of posts (introduced in the middle of the seventies) whose occupants were deprived of the right to appeal to courts of justice against their dismissal.

These restrictions concerned about 23 million people. Their abolition is an important step to further democratize production relations.

In connection with inter-ethnic rioting in the city of Osh, Kirghizia, parliamentarians adopted an appeal to the people of that union republic. They expressed condolences to the families of people killed in the clashes and rioting and called upon citizens of all nationalities to quell outbursts of blind hatred among people. The Soviet parliament demanded that state and law enforcement bodies put an end to outrage and restore peace and security.

The third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is due to complete its work next week. At the next joint session of the two chambers, scheduled for Tuesday, June 12, the deputies will hear President Mikhail Gorbachev's report on the results of his visit to the United States.

Supreme Soviet Committee Adopts Porn Statement

LD0906154890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Women's Affairs, the Family, Mothers and Children has adopted a decision which says, inter alia, that today the spiritual education of our children arouses serious alarm: Eroticism, pornography, cruelty, and violence have flooded pages of books and magazines, our screens and theater stages. The video business has assumed the scope of a national calamity in this country. Therefore, it is not surprising that much younger people resort to drugs, alcoholism, and prostitution. The under-age crime rate is growing. We demand that the president and the government of our country protect our children from pornogenocide and the artibrariness of publications, television, video and the cinema business. This statement has been signed by 150 people's deputies of the USSR.

People's Deputies Set Up Security Review Group

PM0706132690 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 22, 10-17 Jun 90 p 13

[Dmitriy Yakushkin report: "New Working Group"]

[Text] The new working group of people's deputies, set up to revise the concept of comprehensive national security and to suggest means and mechanisms of ensuring it, held its first meeting at the USSR Supreme Soviet. Members of the group are expected to complete the first phase of their work by the beginning of parliament's autumn session.

The group includes about 20 USSR people's deputies who earlier took part in the preliminary analysis of security issues, as well as representatives of relevant parliamentary committees. Experts from academic and specialized research centers will also be involved. However, the proposed list of experts has not been approved yet. The group is headed by Academician Yuriy Ryzhov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Which aspects of national security will the group concentrate on? Group members say there are five major areas: military-political security (external and internal), economic, ecological, and informational security.

All work must proceed with maximum openness. Yuriy Ryzhov believes it to be a sine qua non. Once the draft concept is prepared it will be subject to discussion by the academic community. MOSCOW NEWS will keep the public informed of the group's progress. The first question to be discussed is: What are the USSR's interests and what could threaten them?

Political & Social

Gorbachev Interviewed by BBC 8 Jun

PM0806225990 London BBC Television Network in English 1845 GMT 8 Jun 90

["Exclusive" interview with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev by reporter Jonathan Dimbleby on 8 June in the Kremlin; Gorbachev remarks in Russian with superimposed English translation—recorded]

[Text] [Dimbleby] Mr. President, the prime minister is known to be one of your most enthusiastic supporters. Is that support useful to you here in the Soviet Union?

[Gorbachev] Well, actually your prime minister and I have had lively and enjoyable talks. This has become a tradition. We have built up a definite atmosphere of trust and openess which enables us to focus on all the main questions. And I think that today's visit and the talks that we have had, plus our previous negotiations, have always been profound and concentrated on important issues. From that point of view everything, everything in our relations, including our talks with your prime minister, is important to us. Anglo-Soviet relations are an important part of our policy. We value them. And I think that as a result of our joint efforts, our relations have gained momentum and are becoming more effective and more profound. And I think all that helps and is mutually beneficial. And in this case in the context of perestroyka the outcome of our political and economic relations is useful to us.

[Dimbleby] Your admirers in the West see the Soviet Union going through a historic convulsion. They see you as being the architect of a great process of liberation in East Europe. And therefore many of them are worried. They look at what is happening here and they say to themselves: What is going to happen to the Soviet Union? And as you know, in the chancelleries of Europe they also say: Will President Gorbachev survive? Do you understand their fear on your behalf?

[Gorbachev] I could answer briefly. I welcome their solidarity and it won't be a hinderance to me. But that would probably be no answer. You know what is happening in the Soviet Union is vastly significant for the peoples who live here.

A while ago when I was analyzing what is happening here and the problems which have accumulated I once observed we can't go on living like this. That was said the day before I was elected general secretary of the CPSU. And it was that assessment that prompted me to agree to take on those responsibilities when I had realized what needed to be done. All the same, even if you know and understand that society is sick, that it needs radical treatment, then you can't duck the issue. Moreover, your conscience would simply not allow you to. Although I had no intention of leading the country it was precisely those considerations that caused me to accept the proposal of my comrades that I should shoulder the responsibility. Since then we have been following that course, a policy whose essence and purpose is to renew society on democratic principles; to give our vision of the socialist idea a second chance in order that society should start to favor the individual, bringing in more freedom and democracy, and thus unleash the energies of society and the people. The potential is vast. So by following that policy we have reached the present situation. Today's stage of development is the most important because we have come out onto... well, we are experiencing fundamental changes in the economy and economic system and in the political process and political reform, and relations between the nationalities, the life of the federation itself. The party is in the midst of profound change as are other core institutions such as the army, etc. And in fact everything should be resolved in the course of the coming months or a year or two.

[Dimbleby] But when you look at the turmoil from outside those analysts who say that what they are frightened of is that a combination of the ethnic unrest, the nationalist questions, and the economic uncertainties, the shortages and so on, could provoke a situation—and I think it is important for you, for the outside world, to address this—that would create such civil strife as to bring even the military back in again. Do you utterly discount that possibility?

[Gorbachev] I shall answer your supplementary [as heard] by continuing my thought. If I develop my train of thought these are the basic ideas. Given that we have fundamental changes, these can't take place easily without pain or difficulty. Whoever promises simple cures, simple solutions for these basic problems, is either consciously or unconsciously deceiving the people. For that reason in any areas of society that you mention—the economy, trade, interethnic relations, the army—things are not easy. People are wondering if everything is being done correctly, has everything been thought through properly, are the decisions being made sufficiently competently? I would answer these questions which I think are natural and arise from the alarm that people are feeling about their future, I would say that overall these concerns were natural and only to be expected. And we did forsee them. Such changes are not easy. That is my first point.

Secondly, we have made mistakes one has to admit. We are moving in areas where there is no experience. Besides, other peoples' experiences are not necessarily applicable to the Soviet Union. If we slavishly copy others without taking the realities into account, our society is vast and has enormous potential but it is also a complex society, and if we impose artificially other peoples' values and ways of life we would be again conforming to the models that have been imposed on our society in the past, and using old approaches. We cannot allow that. For that reason we are watching carefully and following the course of perestroyka step by step. And it seems to me that the main thing that I must tell you today is that we are on the right path. We have made the right choice. Nobody over the past five years has been able to put forward any fundamental alternative.

Yes, there has been justified comment and criticism about the mistakes and omissions. I am not talking people who are into demagoguery or political speculation. At the end of the day they are not the decision-makers although I must say that they are making a bad situation worse and that is disrupting progress. So I continue to think that our people will accept and understand all the changes, will think them over for themselves. If the people don't think these things over for themselves then we will be unable to carry through our so-called revolution from above. And the fact that by reform, by democracy, by glasnost we are now, through new incentives, involving the people themselves in economic life, is I think a guarantee that in the long run perestroyka will be successful and it will confer its benefits on us. The only question now is how to make it less painful and go faster in order to shorten this difficult transitional stage. But at the same time we simply adopt a specific time limit and conform to it. To define and adhere to specific time limits would be reminiscent of the period of collectivization when a task was given a time limit. For instance to integrate the collective farms. We cannot proceed like that. We have left behind the old ways of doing things. We are moving toward new ones and periods of instability like the present always accompany such changes, and the transitional period we are in needs to be shortened as much as possible so as to make the transition as painless as possible. And I think that for the people who have nailed their colors to the mast of perestroyka it is important that they should be involved with this their chosen destiny.

Perestroyka has been adopted by each generation and by every section of society and it will succeed. So to boil it down to just Gorbachev or a group of people would be frivolous, although I wouldn't underestimate the role of the people who have shouldered the responsibility for carrying out these fundamental reforms and I count myself among them. We shall do all we can to preserve the consensus in our society about perestroyka and on the basis of that consensus embark on the difficult stages that now face us. And I am confident that through discussion and debate, despite the difficulties, we shall reach a smoother path of development and that will bear fruit for our people.

[Dimbleby] There will be a great many people who hope, and possibly believe, that you are right. They will say, some of them, that you have had additional impediments put in your way, and they will think of the person whom you once called a demagogue. Are you able, in Mrs. Thatcher's phrase, to do business with the new president of the Russian Parliament when you have been so critical of each other? And is it important to be able to do business with that person?

[Gorbachev] I have already answered that question as it was put to me on the day after Comrade Yeltsin's election, just after I had arrived in Canada, at the airport. I think that if the chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin acts constructively, in the spirit of perestroyka, and acts in that way during the sittings of the Congress and the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, I think this will be supported from the Soviet Union, and he can count on cooperation. There is no place for emotions, personal sympathies and antipathies, as it were. And anyway, these are all matters that I don't regard as insuperable. The line he takes will be decisive. The statements of the last few days before his election are one thing, what he will do now, we'll see.

[Dimbleby] Is it important that he doesn't suggest when he comes into power that there has to be Russian sovereignty over and above Soviet sovereignty. Has he got to discard that sort of idea to make a working relation possible?

[Gorbachev] Well, I don't think that everything depends on Comrade Yeltsin's position. The Congress and Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation will decide. And Russians have a lot of common sense. So there is not much chance of anyone foisting irresponsible decisions on them, including Comrade Yeltsin.

[Dimbleby] When you look at the Soviet Union, and at the conflict in the Baltic states, you have said that there can be secession so long as it is by the constitutional route. Is it your view that down the road the shape of the Soviet Union, the borders of the Soviet Union, can change? That the unity as it now is can shift?

[Gorbachev] I tend to take an optimistic view of the future of the Soviet Union and the Federation. But only with one obligatory condition, that this union of sovereign states has to undergo fundamental change, reform itself. By the way, on the 12th of June there will be a meeting of the Council of the Soviet Federation when the first debates of members of the Federation will take place about the time-scale and the methods to implement the idea of reforming the union. I think when we become part of a vital full-blooded federation which will combine the independence, autonomy, and sovereignty of the republics, and with an effective working center enjoin the rights delegated to it by the republics themselves and guaranteed by the Constitution, that will mean success for all our peoples. Why? Because, nevertheless, in the years that have passed, despite all the negative processes, despite the fact that interethnic problems have accumulated which are far from simple—you must remember that glasnost and democracy have brought them all up to the surface—nonetheless, as I was saying, during those years events have taken place which have bound our peoples very tightly together. Both on a human level and through science and culture. And particularly in relation to economics, the distribution of labor, the division of labor within the federation, the economic specialization within the Soviet Union. Each republic therefore needs cooperation with other republics. One way or another they are all closely linked with one another. And I take an optimistic view as we have chosen this kind of approach. Throughout the world the processes of integration are predominant. And in this connection, this context, I think that the process of disintegration which everybody talks about so much, you probably mention it in your programs, people say that there are signs of it, and so on, I think that is a very superficial view. It is not a process of disintegration that's going on. It's a process of the renewal of the federation, which is taking on new qualities, and we will do this in such a way as to synchronize the process, so to speak, with all the processes of perestroyka. That's the first thing. As for the Baltic republics and self-determination, you know this is a principle of the Constitution. Each republic in accordance with a particular article of the Constitution enjoys the right of self-determination, including secession. That remains. Additionally, until now there was no mechanism, no law containing the mechanism, to implement this right. Now there is such a law. It has been passed by the Supreme Soviet. So where the matter arises democratically, on a democratic basis, where the will of one nation or another expresses the desire to change, to leave the Soviet Union, to exercise that constitutional right, all the constitutional grounds for this exist. If that is the nation's will, the process has to take place in particular constitutional forms. As for Lithuania, that's a particularly graphic case. That you know is an attempt to sidestep the constitutional process. An element which does not accord with perestroyka. An attempt carried out, by the way, by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, and not on the basis of a referendum. And these questions must be decided by a popular referendum. And I would say that an underhand method, an anticonstitutional approach, has brought about a situation from which it's hard for us to find a way out. Nevertheless, we are searching for that way out. We are committed to returning this process to a constitutional path, and resolving the problem within that framework. You know, I think that the people who organized this, tried to push this through by a coup in the middle of the night, having their own show of hands, and ignoring the people's will, they are afraid of referendums, they are afraid of the people's will because they would be unlikely to obtain the people's support. Even in Lithuania where most of the people are Lithuanian, people know the score. They sense it even more now that ties with the Soviet Union have been broken.

[Dimbleby] If there is to be the future that you want, most people in the West believe President Gorbachev has to be at the helm. Do you share their view?

[Gorbachev] Well, you know I have to answer simply by putting forward my own position, because at the end of the day I am at the helm, or maybe I won't be at the helm. That needs to be decided democratically now, based on the existing constitutional processes. It is a question of life taking its course. But I would like to set out my own position. I did once say something about it. Perestroyka is the choice I have made. My destiny as a man and as a politician is linked with it. And I shall not be diverted from that path, whatever the pressures that are brought to bear on me. Whatever powers I have at my disposal, I shall use to continue this process. And first and foremost I see my task as uniting all the forces of perestroyka, all the different shades, the democtratic forces of this society, to assist the success of perestroyka. That's my position. A position from which I shall never be moved.

[Dimbleby] If you succeed, can you imagine, I don't say that you are certain, can you imagine that we will have in the Soviet Union by the end of this decade a multiparty democracy within a free market economy?

[Gorbachev] I think that the Soviet Union's future is a mixed economy, political pluralism, a democratic state with the human being at its center, a society where fundamental questions of social justice and the protection of human beings will have pride of place. I think that all these things will lead to a fuller realization of the socialist idea as it is understood, as we understand it. But that is a separate question about which one could say a great deal.

[Dimbleby] Mr. President, you never want to take a rest, and, say, give someone else a chance?

[Gorbachev] [deep sigh] Rest is just something to dream about.

[Dimbleby] Thank you very much for talking to us.

Medvedev Chairs Group Forming Congress Program

Medvedev Interviewed

LD0906151190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The second session of the working group of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for the Preparation of the Platform for the 28th party congress took place in Moscow. [video shows meeting in progress]

A great deal is connected with the concept of democracy: it is not only a matter of a minister and a worker joining the same line but it is above all a matter of them being able to tackle common problems together. It seems that a process like that is under way in practice—not in words—in the party. After all, is this not indicative that in the work of the Commission for the Draft Platform, both Central Committee secretaries and representatives of primary party organizations are taking active part? What is more, by substantiating their arguments they are participating in it in a vigorous, energetic, but above all bold and sincere fashion. [video cuts to show Medvedev being interviewed in an office by an unidentified reporter]

[Reporter] Vadim Andreyevich, almost a month has passed since the discussion of the first draft. How do you think the work has advanced and at what stage it is now?

[Medvedev] The first discussion was kind of a beginning of our work, I would say. Then we exchanged views as to how the results and the progress of the precongress debates were to be reflected in the program document, what problems were to be singled out first, what was to be taken into account and which issues were to be raised again.

A large group of delegates recently elected to the 28th congress have been invited to the commission sitting today from Moscow and other towns of our country. All of them noted that we have managed to make progress on the questions which have attracted special attention in the course of the precongress debates, and we have made progress on the critical considerations which were expressed—and they were very poignant—admittedly as witnessed by the position of the Moscow communists which has been published in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA and which is heading in the same direction. And that shows that we are evidently proceeding in the directions dictated by public sentiments and expectations.

We also propose structural changes. We propose that the document should be more concise and compressed so that it could indeed be a document representing the party as a public, political, and vanguard organization and that it should contain proposals on and an assessment of the current situation, and a proposal on the way out of this situation, as seen by the party. That is how this work is developing. We wish to build it on foundations which are as open and as democratic as possible so that the process of preparations for the congress in that section could reflect to the maximum degree the democratic aspirations of communists, party members, and of our entire society.

Working Group Meets

LD0906015990 Moscow TASS in English 2239 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS—A program document of the Soviet Communist Party, which is to be submitted to its 28th congress, is aimed at accumulating the collective intellect of the nation and serving as a reliable basis ifor the consolidation of Soviet soceity. This was stated at the second session of the working group of the commission of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee for preparing the Congress of Soviet Communists, held here on Friday.

The session was chaired by Politburo member and Central Committee Secretary Vadim Medvedev. He pointed out that much had been done since the first session. A new, revised text of the programme document was prepared. It includes many remarks and proposals, contianed in letters and appeals of communists, newspaper articles and alternative platformns.

Pointing to the new elements in the structure and content of the revised document, Medvedev suggested that particpants in the session focus attention on the key problems which should be taken into account at the final stage of preparations. Specifically, attention was called to the ned for analysing in a more profound and comprehensvie way the questions raised most keenly in the discussion preceding the congress—about the party's role and place in perestroyka, about its social basis, its policy with regard to the economic reform, the character and causes of the crisis of our society and ways to overcome it.

Speakers at the session pointed out that many things remained unclear concerning the party's priority objectives, modern understanding of socialism and the communist perspective. Some speakers warned against the simplification of the sitaution and urged to explain objective laws governing the development of society.

Many speakers criticised the draft programme document for the lack of clarity on the party's stand and suggested that it be considerably reduced.

Medvedev Addresses Group

LD0906151290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0758 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Unscheduled program, captioned "At the session of the working group of the CPSU Central Committee commission to prepare the platform for the party congress]

[Text] [Presenter] The program document of the CPSU which is to be presented to its 28th congress for discussion is called upon to absorb the collective wisdom of the people, to serve as the reliable basis for consolidating Soviet society. This was the subject of the second session of the working group of the CPSU Central Committee commission to prepare for the forum of Soviet Union Communists which took place in Moscow on 8 June. The session was chaired by Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. [video shows Medvedev chairing a meeting of at least 20 people]

[Medvedev] Comrades, we have been presented with a renovated, substantially reworked draft document. Many criticisms and proposals contained in letters and messages from communists in the press and various alternative platforms have been taken into consideration as we agreed last time. Today's discussion is, of course, not the conclusion of the work, but is another stage in it. Life itself is very dynamic and could require considerable amendments to the document. The work of the Supreme Soviet is continuing, with its discussion of the program for the transfer to a regulated market economy. It is meeting with a rather complicated and mixed reaction in the country. The Congress of People's Deputies of Russia is under way and it is animatedly discussing questions of the life of the country's largest republic. Pre-congress discussion is under way and continuing, as is the report-back and election campaign, and proposals on the draft platform and other congress documents are continuing to come in.

At present acute discussion is continuing about the name of the party and this, as you understand, has a far-reaching and not just terminoligical nature. Proposals are being heard to rename the party the Socialist Party, the Social-Democratic Party, the Party of Democratic Socialism, the Social Democratic Workers Party. And other names are being proposed. A number of comrades even regard the question of renaming the party as a condition for their continued membership in it. Evidently, this problem will be raised at the congress, too.

I am convinced that the name of the party should not be changed. In the first place, this is opposed by the overwhelming majority of members of the CPSU who joined the Communist Party, specifically. Secondly, this is the Leninist name of the party which is of historic, political, and moral importance to us. Finally, and this is stated in the proposed draft, we remain the party not only of the socialist choice but also of the communist view of the future.

On the structure of the document which has been presented. At the previous session we agreed on a three-part structure for the document, on having three separate sections instead of what was proposed, instead of the seven in the published draft. I think that the document gains from this and becomes more compact and logical.

The preamble has been fundamentally altered. Whereas previously it discussed the course of perestroyka, now the preamble singles out the deep-seated reasons for the crisis which the country is undergoing and which is connected with the deformed model of socialism which arose in our country in specific historic conditions of the initial stage of the appearance and development of the new system, with the incapability of the authoritarian-bureaucratic system to get the country onto the broad road of public progress along the course of human civilization. In my opinion, the preamble gives a fundamentally important definition of perestroyka as the change-over from state-authoritarian-bureaucratic system to a humane and democratic socialism.

The first section has undergone major changes. Its name has been changed. The proposed name now is: "The Ideological and Theoretical Foundations of Perestroyka." Four blocks are proposed. There is here, so to say, awareness of what naturally was in the published draft, including such subsections as what heritage the CPSU is renouncing, what the CPSU is taking with it into the future. This last block is supplemented with the clause that the CPSU proceeds from a creative approach to the theory of socialism, which develops along the paths of contructive interpretation of the historic experience of the 20th century, the experience of general world development.

The third block is designated, in accordance with the many observations, proposals, and criticisms which have been voiced about the draft, "The Social Ideals of Communists." In it the attempt is made to give some sort of description of humane, democratic socialism, to confirm the party's adherence to the communist view of the future. Evidently, we should assess how successfully this has been done. I think that, of course, this is not the final word by a long way and that this is not the very best that could be given.

This section gives a description of the present stage of perestroyka. And there are specific problems and difficulties set out here. And the difficulties are shown to be linked not only with our historical heritage, but are also shown in tangible, and quite clear and precise form, to be linked with specific decisions and actions which have been taken in the course of perestroyka during the past five years.

The section entitled "For an Efficient Economy" has, naturally, been reworked. It sets out the main aspects of the current progam for transferring to a regulated market economy. In this sense many ideas of a program overlap with the government's economic program. But evidently, we should not duplicate the proposals made by the executive power.

And, I think that it was you who noted this, look at the clause on questions of socialist property. Here, too, there is much requiring discussion and clarification. In particular, the clause about whether state property can exist in the joint-stock form. It is well-known that many postulators deny this and consider joint-stock property no longer state property, and even no longer publicly owned property.

There are new aspects connected with the introduction of the clause on labor private property, the historic potential of which has not been exhausted, and it is stressed that this, under democratic control by the working people, can work to improve the life of the people and work for socialism.

Speaking of this section of clauses of the program, perhaps one should give some thought to the fact that it is necessary not only to formulate various proposals, but also to try to disclose the mechanism for implementing the corresponding proposals of the CPSU, taking into account that in contemporary conditions the CPSU should not and cannot issue instructions to state and economic bodies. It should act through communists working there, in the soviets, in the government, and so on.

And, of course, everything should be weighed from the point of view that there should not just be demands to increase allocations, to increase the share of resources in each case, and at the same time this would not correspond with proposals concerning how and with what resources this was to be done, so that we do not enter upon the path of creating irresponsible programs which, so to say, put forward demands but absolutely avoid the question of how these demands can be implemented.

The greatest changes have been made to the section concerning the radical restructuring of the party. Well, this is quite natural. Questions of the role of the party, its functions and methods, and forms of work, its place in the political system occupy the central place in party-wide discussions and, in fact, this is the center, the central concept, of the whole program document, but I think this question will be at the center of attention of the party congress, too.

I think one can state that this section, in general, takes into consideration to quite a marked extent the proposals from the alternative platforms.

The draft formulates more clearly the functions of the party, which in many ways are similar to the democratic platform's interpretation. I am referring to the theoretical, ideological, political, and organizational functions. In my view, the draft at present formulates the political functions in a rather narrow way, which in essence amounts to preelection struggle and parliamentary activity, although it is well-known that political work among the masses must be carried out on a daily basis and not only during elections. It says democratic principles will be firmly conducted in the CPSU, guaranteeing power to the party masses, multi-candidate elections, glasnost, accountability, replaceability, the subordination of the minority to the majority, and the right of the minority to defend their views.

On the principle of the party structure: The working group proposes the confirmation of the territorial-industrial principle of the structure, but to stress that the tasks of political struggle and political work, which is conducted among the population, make it necessary to develop strong, active, primary, territorial organizations. It is proposed to give members of the CPSU the right to choose their primary organization—industrial, territorial, or both—in which they will carry out their work and develop their political activity.

On the creation of a Communist Party of Russia: It is proposed to support the creation of a Communist Party of Russia, which is supported by the overwhelming majority of the communists of the republic, a Communist Party of Russia as an important factor in strengthening the sovereignty of the largest union republic of our union. But, naturally, the creation of the Communist Party must be regarded in the general context of the strengthening of the CPSU and not of weakening the CPSU, let alone of dividing it into national units.

You will have noted that in the draft which has been distributed to you there are no clauses about party bodies, mass information organs, the budget, or the structure of the supreme leading bodies. This has been done because these are questions for the rules and they will be set out in full in the draft CPSU rules.

At the same time, one very important heading has been added, on interaction between the party and other public organizations acting within the framework of the Constitution, on the development of dialogue and cooperation with movements and organizations with a socialist orientation.

That is a short and far-from-complete list of what the comrades have managed to do in this period. All the members of the commission have had the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the proposed text and I think that all of them have many ideas which have arisen during the process of getting acquainted with this material. I would like to stress once again that this is, of course, a sort of intermediate working version and we must do the maximum to ensure that the final version should include to the greatest extent the results of the pre-congress discussion, the collective wisdom of communists so that the document should serve as the basis for the consolidation of the party and should give as little grounds as possible for division, let alone for a split in the party ranks.

[Presenter] All of these questions were in the center of a lively discussion with the participation of communists, representatives of science, various sectors of the national economy, and the mass media. The majority of those who spoke were delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and judging from their active position today, one can to a certain extent form an opinion of the upcoming forum, and the very important problems which must be tackled by the country's communists along with the whole people.

It was stressed that it was particularly important to proceed from the problems of real life, to compare the document in preparation against the objective situation; the crisis in society, the growth in social tension, and the appearance of various platforms within the party.

It was considered appropriate to conduct further work on the draft document with wider participation by congress delegates and also the authors of alternative platforms.

New Name for Communist Party To Be Discussed

AU0906142290 Paris AFP in English 1023 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 9 (AFP)—The question of whether to change the name of the Soviet Communist Party is likely to be discussed at the next party conference opening on July 2, a top Kremlin official Vadim Medvedev has said. Mr. Medvedev, the party's ideology chief, said a "lively debate" was already going on inside the party about the issue. "As you can imagine, a new name would mean much more than a minor question of semantics," Mr. Medvedev said, during a meeting of the party's central committee on Friday, extracts of which were televised on Saturday. The meeting was being held to prepare for the July conference.

Some party members, Mr. Medvedev said, would like the Communist Party to be rebaptized the Socialist Party or the Social-Democratic Party. Others preferred names such as Workers Social-Democratic Party or Party of Democratic Socialism. "Some comrades have insisted that they would quit the party unless it is renamed," Mr. Medvedev said. He added, however, that the "vast majority" of party members wanted the Communist Party to retain its name.

For his part, Mr. Medvedev said he was "strongly convinced" that the Soviet Communist Party's Leninist name had a "moral and historical value," and that is was essential that the party be based on "a socialist choice and communist views." Mr. Medvedev recalled the creation of the Russian Communist Party, which was abolished during the 1920s and incorporated into the Soviet Communist Party. Mr. Medvedev said that an "overwhelming majority" of ethnic Russians were in favor of the return of a Russian Communist Party, which he said would be "an important factor" in the "sovereignty" of the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic. The creation of a Russian Communist Party should be part of an effort to strengthen, not weaken, the existing Soviet Communist Party, or divide it down nationalist lines, he said.

This weekend, a congress is being held in Leningrad to discuss the possibility of founding a Russian Communist Party. Boris Guidaspoz, the city's party chief, is hoping to found the new party in an attempt to counter the reforms sweeping the country.

Russians Denounce Television Blackout on Yeltsin

AU0906140590 Paris AFP in English 1103 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 9 (AFP)—Russian legislators Saturday denounced the failure of Soviet state television to air Boris Yeltsin's appeal to the Russian people to unite.

The call by the controversial president of the Russian Federation was to have gone on the air Friday night, hours after Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev pleaded for national unity. Earlier, the Russian parliament, in a new challenge to central authority, defiantly voted that its laws should take "precedence" over Soviet legislation.

MPs Saturday blasted the apparent blackout as a "violation of the Russian president's constitutional rights". However a motion demanding the resignation of Mikhail Nienachev, chairman of the state television and radio organization Gosteleradio, was narrowly defeated.

Mr. Yeltsin, a fervent reformer and critic of Mr. Gorbachev, told parliament the television had agreed to broadcast an appeal "for national unity" that Congress had asked him to make "to the Russian people" because of the "difficult political situation" in the republic. Mr. Yeltsin, drawing loud applause, said Mr. Nienachev's explanation that he was dropped because of the length of a press conference by Mr. Gorbachev and visiting British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was "not enough". Television chairman Mr. Nienachev then pledged to parliament that the appeal would be broadcast Saturday night.

Readiness To Clear Up Wallenberg Case Renewed

AU0806124290 Paris AFP in English 1215 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Copenhagen, June 8 (AFP)—The Soviet Union will provide all information and documents to investigators of the mystery disappearance of Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg after World War II, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy said here Friday. [passage omitted]

Speaking at a press conference, Mr. Petrovsky hailed Mr. Wallenberg's "tremendous contribution to the human cause" but he stressed that there was "no evidence, no proof contradicting the fact that the Swede died on the given date [1947]".

Soviet authorities were keeping in touch with the diplomat's family and nongovernment organizations to help clear up exactly what became of the Swedish diplomat.

Mr. Petrovsky recalled that the late human rights leader Andrey Sakharov and other Soviet figures had been unable to contradict the official version of Mr. Wallenberg's death.

Coal Miners' Congress Scheduled for 11 Jun

LD0806132590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 8 Jun

[Report over video by correspondent Ye. Kuznetsov from Vorkuta]

[Text] Less than a month remains before the general strike announced at a conference of Vorkuta workers is due to start. Over 1 million tons of coal have accumulated at the storage depots. This shows, the miners decided, that either our production is not needed or the government does not know what amount of fuel the country requires. Since April, threatened by the strike, the railwaymen have managed to transport more than half of the coal kept at the storage depots. But this has not stopped preparations for the strike, for even now, deserted approach tracks and mountains of deteriorating fuel are a daily sight there. [video shows heaps of coal, idle freight trains]

[V.I. Tukan, deputy chairman of Vorkuta the Town Workers' Committee, identified by caption] The congress of miners will take place in Donetsk on 11 June, and the issue of the general strike will be definitively solved at the congress, and not for Vorkuta alone but it will be solved for the entire ministry.

Peasants Union Inaugural Congress Opens 11 Jun

Congress Previewed

LD1106102990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] The inaugural congress of the USSR Peasants' Union [Krestyanskiy Soyuz SSSR] opens today in Moscow. It is to take place in the Rossiya state concert hall. Among the delegates are people from the most varied rural professions: machine operators, livestock breeders, agronomists, livestock specialists, and leaders of collective and state farms and processing plants.

After registration on Saturday and Sunday, the delegates visited the Exhibition of Achievements in the National Economy and got to know the capital. The congress is intended to adopt the rules of the union and several other important documents connected with the life of Soviet peasants.

Gorbachev, Others Attend

LD1106112990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Excerpt] As we have reported, the constituent congress of the USSR Peasant's Union opened today in Moscow. Present were comrades Gorbachev, Lukyanov, Ryzhkov, Maslyukov, Ligachev, Stroyev, and other officials. [passage omitted]

Orthodox Church Elects New Patriarch

Aleksiy Chosen

LD0706231390 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 7 TASS—The local council of the Russian Orthodox Church, which is being held at the Trinity-St.Sergius Lavra, in the Moscow region, elected today a new patriarch of Moscow and all Russia. The post, which remained Vacant after the death of Patriarch Pimen, was pilled by Aleksey, metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod, who was elected by secret ballot by the majority of participants in the local council.

The council is continuing its work. On Friday it will canonise a new saint—Archpriest John of Kronstadt. The canonisation service will be performed by members of the Holy Synod in the Assumption Cathedral of the Lavra. Then, late at night, participants in the local council will return to Moscow after adopting documents of the council and holding a final meeting.

Gorbachev Sends Congratulations

LD1006121990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1155 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 10 Jun (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev, USSR president, and Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, have congratualated Aleksiy, patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, on his appointment to this post.

The Soviet leaders expressed the hope that the efforts of the Russian Orthodox Church, together with the clergy and believers of other religions and churches, will continue to be directed toward the consolidation of compatriots and all people of good will, regardless of pholosphy or political convictions, and the creation of a new, humane, and just community of mankind.

Reception Honors Aleksiy

LD1006234290 Moscow TASS in English 2021 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—A reception in honour of newly-elect Patriarch of Moscow and All-Russia Aleksiy II was given at the St. Daniel Monastry in Moscow today.

The reception was attended by Patriarch-Catholicos of All Georgia Ilia II, members of the holy synod of the

Russian Orthodox church, bishops and other representatives of the church council, clergymen from Moscow and other Soviet cities, Father Superiors and inhabitants of monasteries and convents, as well as professors, teachers and students of theological seminaries and acadamies.

Also present were chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov and the heads of the Councils for Religious Affairs at the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the Russian Federation.

Patriarch Aleksiy was greeted by the hierarchs of Christian churches and representatives of other faiths—Moslems, Buddhists and Judists.

In his reply speech Patriarch Aleksiy thanked the guests for the kind feelings expressed in every speech.

Patriarch Aleksiy made an excursus into the history of the St. Daniel Monastry. He noted that the small Moscow principality of Prince Daniel—the son of Saint Aleksandr Nevsky—expanded several times by the end of his life. This extension was made peacefully and not by forces. "This is a good example that the unification of peoples around Moscow took place on a peaceful and spiritual basis. Brothers and fellow-countrymen, let us build our home without destroying the foundations laid down by our forefathers," Aleksiy said.

Komsomol Draft Laws Discussed

WA0506191690 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 90 p 1

[Text] Based on its right to display legislative initiative, the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee Bureau determined its position with reference to a number of draft laws intended for discussion before the end of the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The bureau considers it possible to support the draft law "On the Press and Other Mass Media" (second reading). Having commented on its controversial character, the bureau would like to underline the following provision of the law as its most fundamental: The people have the right to found a mass medium. The bureau considers this right to be a powerful stimulus for the enhancement of the spiritual life of the country.

The bureau also expresses support for the provisions of the law that offer a democratic mechanism for interaction between the founder and the editors. The abolishment of censorship is viewed as a definite advantage of the draft.

At the same time the bureau thinks that the law should specify the right of employees to a share in the profits.

In its evaluation of the draft law "On the Freedom of Conscience and On Religious Organizations" the Komsomol Central Committee Bureau wants to comment that the drafters of the law could not overcome their outdated prejudices against the church. The bureau considers it necessary to provide a legal mode for the church that would be approximated as much as possible to the conditions under which any public organization can function.

The bureau supports the draft law provision on alternate public service for persons refusing to serve in the military because of religious convictions. The bureau cannot agree with the absence of this provision in the latest version of the law.

According to the bureau the law was drafted without considering the changes in the sociopolitical situation in the country; it can hardly become the basis and the foundation on which to develop legislation in the republics.

The Komsomol Central Committee Bureau supports the idea of passing the USSR Law "On Soviet Militia."

Although the draft of this law can be accepted in general, the bureau insists on a precise definition of the militia's main tasks, thus leaving no room for their arbitrary interpretation. According to the bureau the phrasing of Part 3, Article 8 suggested in the draft serves to limit the constitutional rights and freedoms of a citizen. In this respect the bureau offers the following opinion: USSR citizens can be asked to help secure public order only of their own free will; the exception is made for occasions described in the USSR legislation.

After the bureau discussed the draft law "On Taxing State, Lease, Cooperative, Public, and Other Organizations" it reiterated the readiness of the Komsomol Central Committee to defend the position of the 21st Congress which was outlined in a special resolution on the subject.

'Centrist' Forces Unite at Moscow Meeting

LD1006031990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports that at a meeting which has taken place in Moscow a centrist moderate radical bloc of political parties and movements has been formed. The basic aims of the creation of the bloc have announced as being the uniting of efforts in the fundamental restructuring of society's life and the reorganization of the state, the creation of an alliance of centrist forces to prevent the influence of extreme left-wing and extreme right-wing groups in political life, and preparations for future election campaigns.

The main political principles of the activities of the bloc were also determined at the meeting. These are the achievement of goals only within the framework of humane laws, excluding force, and not permitting activities aimed at stirring up political, ethnic, religious, and social differences.

Russian Democratic Party Splits Into Factions

LD0506122290 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] The Democratic Party of Russia, recently set up in the Soviet Union, is already splitting into factions. The leaders of the faction of free democrats that has appeared are the chess world champion, Garry Kasparov and People's Deputy of the Russian Federation Mikhail Tolstoy. They are opposing the totalitarian forms of rule being established in the party. Still earlier, at the party's constituent congress held in May, more than 90 delegates walked out. They were protesting the party's conversion into a popular anticommunist party in opposition to the CPSU, as its direction had been described by its elected chairman Nikolay Travkin. The party's programm officially says only that it advocates a multiparty system, a transition to a market economy, and private property.

Bolshoy Theater Workers Begin Hunger Strike

LD0406174890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] [Announcer] We received news today that seven members of the party committee of the Bolshoy Theater, among whom there are two RSFSR People's Artistes, one Merited Artiste, and the full-time party committee members, have gone on a hunger strike. Our correspondent Tatyana Vakulovskaya met Yuriy Aleksandrovich Grigoryev, the RSFSR People's Artiste and the party committee secretary, and asked him what has brought about this protest.

[Grigoryev] The fact of the matter is that in the Bolshoy Theater, the tyranny of the administration is flourishing to the advantage of the ambitions of the artistic director, let's say, of the ballet, Grigorovich, and it is prepared to do illegal things. There is full punishment for criticism. Five people from among members of the party committee have been sacked already and the sixth is getting ready to be sacked—the secretary, in this instance, it's me—without any justification, with a positive character reference, with recommendations for re-election, simply for personal reasons. Incidentally, I'm, not alone. I can be proud that Vasilyev, Maksimova, Plesetskaya, Arkhipova, and others, have been thrown out of the theater in a similar way.

However, that's not what it's about. Our comrades remain who, in our person, are losing their protection. After all, we do not know if others will dare to defend the interests of the collective. Incidentally, 17 people, ballet soloists and artistes, and five leading opera soloists, have left our theater over the past year.

[Correspondent] Well, you signed that address. Could you read it out please?

[Grigoryev] We have appealed to peoples's deputies of the Union, of the republic, of the Moscow City Soviet, to all who cherish Russian and Soviet art. We are informing them that members of the party committee, workers of the theater, are declaring a 24-hour hunger strike against the tyranny of the administration and against its protection by the highest party administrative structures of power. We are protesting against punishment of the party committee of the theater and we regard that as revenge for revealing intrigues to do with flats [kvartirnaya makhinatsiya] by the former leadership of the theater, for criticism of the state of affairs in ballet, for the promulgation of the consortium's agreement.

[Correspondent] Tell us about the consortium's agreement. What is it?

[Grigoryev] That is an agreement on the use of the intellectual property of the theater for business carried out by the British firm Entertainment Corporation Ltd. We, so to speak, put all our intellectual property, all the works which are heard, written, copyrights, on the whole—well, everything, as the saying goes, lock stock and barrel, is put under the control of some British minister, who's got a purely colonizer's way. The firm has the right to sell the licence for the manufacture of produce bearing the mark of the Bolshoy theater, of books and booklets, posters and tee shirts. You of course, know the firm Entertainment Corporation Ltd splendidly! But you don't know the Bolshoy theater! The firm prints Entertainment Corporation Ltd on the back, and on the front: Bolshoy Theater. And for that, it's taking from it 50 percent of the income. So far, nobody knows the sum which the theater has received from this whole deal, and, it seems to me that it is close to nothing.

We, first of all, I should say, that we are for the development of cooperation. We are for the development of cooperation. We are for joint enterprises and joint activity, for the consortium. But we are against being taken for fools in the West.

[Correspondent] That agreement was signed by the director of the Bolshoy Theater?

[Grigoryev] That agreement was signed by Vladimir Mikhailovich Kokonin, general director of the Bolshoy Theater, on behalf of the theater. But the theater found out almost one year later about the existence of that agreement and high party administrative levels of authority are inclined to actively defend that agreement which, so far, has not brought the theater anything.

Yes, we are sending that appeal to the leadership of the Supreme Soviet, to the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR, to the Moscow city soviet, the Culture Fund, with the hope of being heard.

Decontamination Work in Moscow Park

LD1006102890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Summary] Signs reading "Attention. Work on decontamination of the sector being carried out. Don't enter the sector." appeared in Moscow Izmaylovskiy Park. In early June a planned inspection of the park found point sources of radioactive contamination. As (Melnik), chairman of Pervomayskiy rayon executive committee, explained, in the 1950's the park was used as a dumping ground for industrial and domestic waste. Supposedly it was then that the radioactive waste was dumped. Melnik thinks that the contaminated sectors of the park do not present any danger to people. An inquiry is under way.

Economic

Soviet Economist Claims Reforms 'Bound To Fail'

PM0606101690 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 2 Jun 90 (section 2) p 7

[Report on interview with Soviet economist Viktor Belkin, by Flemming Rose; date not given: "Soviet Reforms Judged a Failure"]

[Text] Moscow—"The Soviet Government's economic reform program is doomed to failure. The only things that emerged clearly from the program were price rises. They will be determined centrally. The rest is waffle. And when the government says that things will get worse before they can get better, this is simply speculating on the patience of the Soviet people: In the Soviet Union 50 million people live below the poverty line."

So said prominent Soviet economist Viktor Belkin, who is the man behind the market economy reform program of newly elected Russian leader and reform communist Boris Yeltsin. The Estonian Government has also shown interest in Belkin's model for a transition to a market economy, but nothing came of this, because the Estonians were unable to reach agreement with Moscow on the terms of their economic independence.

BERLINGSKE TIDENDE met with Belkin immediately after he returned home from negotiations with the Belorussian Government.

"Every serious reform consists of two elements: institutional changes—and in the case of the Soviet Union these include private ownership as a motivation for competition and a foundation for high productivity.

"That is one element. I call the other element the technology of reform, that is, how the reforms are put into practice, how we get away from the present command administrative system to a real market economy.

"But none of these problems has been tackled in the the government's reform program," said the 63-year-old economics professor, who works closely with President Mikhail Gorbachev's former top economic adviser, Abel Aganbegyan.

In the mid-sixties Belkin was involved in drafting Prime Minister Kosygin's economic reform program, which was sabotaged, however, by the State Planning Committee, and finally Belkin was unable to defend his doctoral thesis on price reforms.

Belkin described the present Soviet Government as unskilled and unprofessional: "They have not the faintest idea of what a market economy is—and how could they, when the present deputy economy minister and architect of the reforms, Leonid Abalkin, has largely only busied himself with the economy under developed socialism?"

Before the Soviet Government put forward its reform program the Supreme Soviet adopted two new laws: a law on land and a law on property. According to Belkin, both laws are catastrophic as a foundation for the introduction of a market economy, and he made no secret of the fact that he has his doubts about the government's intentions in this respect.

"In reality the law on land is not new. It is simply that the political center has devolved its rights onto local authorities, which can make land available as they think fit.

"And the further you move down through the system—that is, the command administrative bureaucracy—the greater the opposition to change. They sit there like little princes and determine the farmers' future.

"There are no more than 20,000 private farmers in the country and they have enormous difficulties. If they succeed in getting through the legal jungle unscathed and are allocated a piece of land, they have no economic scope. They have no possibility of introducing new technology; they have no access to wholesalers from whom they can buy spare parts, energy, fertilizers, and so on; and they are given the worst pieces of land.

"In short, there is no market economic infrastructure which gives them the chance to exist.

"But the law on property rights is even worse.

"Deputy Economy Minister Abalkin has said that people must not be able to exploit each other in the Soviet Union, where private ownership is seen as the source of all exploitation. That is why, according to Abalkin, there is no need for private ownership in the Soviet Union.

"But in reality things are much worse, since it is the state which exploits people in the Soviet Union. The like has only been seen in ancient Egypt, where people were set to building pyramids and other unnecessary things that were not intended to satisfy human needs.

"In the countries of the West two-thirds of GNP goes in wages, while in the Soviet Union only one-third goes in wages. This means that there is poor motivation and consequently low production. And even though the government program says that the market presupposes independent producers of goods, private ownership has still not been enshrined in law. Absurd, but true," said Belkin, who three years ago, along with two other economists, put his reform model to the Soviet Government but found to his cost that the gentlemen in the Kremlin did not understand it. However, the World Bank in Washington did understand it when Belkin took part in a seminar on the Soviet economy the other day. They even said that there is no other way.

"In the present situation it is necessary to raise people's living standards. And this could easily be done. I will try to explain how.

"A few months ago there was a great deal of uproar when a Soviet collective wanted to sell 12 Soviet tanks abroad and buy consumer goods with the money. The matter almost ended in Prime Minister Ryzhkov's resignation.

"But in reality there ought to be scores of such cooperatives selling for hard currency on the world market excess production, raw materials stocks, and materials which cannot be used because of the current low standard of Soviet technology. In that way it will be possible to buy consumer goods for the money, balance the market, and raise the living standards of citizens without increasing prices.

"In the Supreme Soviet people say that 50 percent of total industrial production disappears into thin air. Some 40 percent of agricultural production suffers the same fate, but one-quarter of total production is completely unnecessary.

"What I am talking about here are the so-called objective possibilities of raising living standards, but there are also a number of subjective possibilities—that is, the very technology of reform. Here I have proposed that a new credit financing system be introduced in which the ruble is made convertible on the Soviet Union's internal market. The means of production could be sold wholesale, and this means that all production would be directed at the consumer and things would not be as now, when all production is subject to the plan and the allocation of means of production is centrally controlled.

"Let me give you an example. When you buy a dress in a store you pay a price for it. The dressmaking factory gets its money from the store, while the dressmaking factory in turn pays the textile factory for the material. The textile factory pays the cotton growers in Uzbekistan, who pay for their machinery and fertilizers, and so on. In this way everything would be sold wholesale, unlike the present situation where everything is allocated centrally without a wholesale system.

"A new credit financing system like this would form the foundation for a market economy, but as long as there is no 'real' money in circuclation nothing will be achieved.

"A well-known U.S. economist once said that the United States moves in the same direction as the consumer's dollars. And the same should apply in the Soviet Union.

"So we cannot go on producing unnecessary goods, because no one wants to buy them," Belkin said.

Bogomolov Examines Economic Reform Program

PM0706152090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 22, 10-17 Jun 90 p 4

[People's Deputy and Academician Oleg Bogomolov article: "Why Drive Ourselves Into an Impasse"]

[Text] Finally, after two months of rumours, conjectures, forecasts, stubborn questions and non-committal answers, the government has presented to parliament its programme for transition to a market economy.

The question is more than ripe—it has long been overdue. The problems of inflation, financial improvement and ownership have permanently figured on the agenda. On repeated occasions my colleagues and I have had to state our views before the Presidential Council, the Council of Ministers and the press.

I can say: regrettably, our proposals have not been heard. The programme submitted for discussion cannot be seen as an effective transition to a market economy.

I've got the impression that whatever the government's idea of the market economy is, it's a kind of plan-and-market hybrid.

A market economy implies freedom to choose the seller and buyer. But why then does the Gossnam [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] system remain? A market means a mechanism for establishing equilibrium, and hence corresponding prices and self-regulation. But these mechanisms are almost not visible in the programme. A market economy means commodities, capital, land, housing and labour. Is it this type of market economy that is in question? I strongly doubt this—the question rather is of a tailored, commodity, and consumer market, only the rudiments of which we have had so far. The market implies free competition and restrictions on monopoly. Some elements of this are mentioned in the programme, but no clear picture is seen here either. The accent on "regulation" essentially cancels all these freedoms.

And for the sake of this quasimarket we have been asked to bear immense sacrifices and resign ourselves to whatever essentially amounts to a twofold increase in prices. The government says that it is opposed to withdrawing money through a currency reform. But this will be much stronger than any reform. In the future, it's true, they have promised to protect the population's deposits by raising the interest on them to 4-9 per cent. But inflation is already above this level and may surpass 20 per cent by the end of this year.

My conclusion is this: the presented programme is purely fiscal in character. Something which largely betrays its objectives: preserve the existing system. And put all the costs, including those linked to the government's mistakes, upon the population.

But this is only part of the troubles it can bring in its wake. The programme has a mechanism of in-built inflation—the system of indexation and compensation. They will have to be paid largely at the expense of enterprises, but the latter will build these costs into production costs, and hence into prices. The result will be the classical spiral of inflation.

It is impossible to improve the economy without abolishing the budget deficit. But it keeps on growing. Today it is as high as some 100 billion roubles (the operation carried out to "depress" it by having recourse to empty loans from the enterprises can be regarded as no more than self-delusion) and may rise to 150 billion by the end of the year. But even here, no feasible solutions have been offered.

But perhaps the most important element lacking in the proposed programme is an answer to the question: what will the incentives for labour amount to? After all, this is the pivot of all things. Yet what does the programme imply? To me, this is not clear. It defines the pivot of the mechanism of incentives as the increase in the value of his work place for every worker. What is it—feudal bondage? Without a market of housing and given the existing system of domicile registration it looks exactly like this.

What can become the incentive for labour if we have just introduced a patently antimarket tax on the population's incomes? It envisages not only an excessively steep scale of the progressive tax, but also the tax discrimination of individual, entrepreneur and cooperative activities. This tax has been pushed through parliament on behalf of the government itself. Now it proposes the same draconic taxes, only this time not on the citizens' incomes but on enterprises' profits. When the profitability level reaches 30 per cent, the whole of the "superprofit" is being withdrawn into the budget. Where are the incentives and who, such being the case, will fill our market with goods and services? Most likely we come to face not merely the absence of a mechanism of incentives, but rather the imposition of a mechanism of anti-incentives. What's more, people are getting caught kind of under a double press: growing prices, on the one hand, and the impossibility to make money, to compensate for soaring prices with their work and initiative, on the other.

The increase in prices will be more or less acceptable for people when they get an opportunity to make additional earnings—overtime, cooperatives, new jobs in the individual sector.

Lastly, complete uncertainty remains with regard to the transformation of ownership. The problems of privatization and freedom for producers have not been worked out, the mechanism for this is either nonexistent or very doubtful.

It is proposed, for example, that housing should be redeemed in the course of 10 to 15 years. The same with the shares in enterprises, stores and other trading facilities. I don't say that redemption is generally impossible. And yet I believe that our citizens must be given their share of property not only through sales, but also in other ways.

All the talks about poverty notwithstanding, our country is sufficiently rich and the state possesses an immense amount of property. But people have been alienated from this property. There is a need to return at least part of it to the people. Everyone has his share in the national wealth. It is not only today that it would be advisable to think of how to transfer it to everyone. But it is exactly now that we are going to pass over to the market that such a decision would be particularly meaningful. On getting a share of property, everyone must also get the right to sell it, mortgage it or use it for obtaining a credit. This is important because the market cannot operate effectively without proprietors. But, besides this, this property could really protect people against soaring prices and inflation—and do this much more dependably than the compensating increments to wages in roubles which are modest in size and empty in content. It may be worthwhile to make land privately owned by young families. Or to give people housing, transport, production premises, etc., for a very low pay.

I believe that today the government has opted for an impasse-like road of transition to the market. All signs point out to a desire to combine extra economic coercion with the market: at first, there will be more administrative control and less market, but then—less administrative control and more self-regulation. But a hybrid cannot work: an attempt to make it work has been made by Hungarians, Poles and Yugoslavs' alike, but the result has been the same.

Is there a different way out? Of course, there is, or rather there are two. The first is to cut the time entry into the market economy to the minimum, to jump into it all at once, simultaneously freeing practically all prices from control, i.e., having recourse to what has become known as "shock therapy". But, as I see it, this road doesn't suit us. There is another one: develop the market sectors in the economy, beginning primarily with the agrarian sector, and grant real freedom to the producer in the development of production, in the establishment of relations and in the choice of partners. There are also other sectors which are the most responsive to economic freedom and quickly yield returns... Regrettably, the government's programme again proposes developing agriculture on semi-feudal principles—introduce the tax in kind, or rather: retain the same state order... We must also take advantage of our public property and use it, at last, for the benefit of all people. The state should not behave like a dog in a manger: it must share this property, making the transition to the market, accompanied as it is by the inevitable release of prices, easier for people to endure.

But the release of prices is not their one-shot increase in the same administrative vein. What the government has managed to achieve is an unprecedented buying spree: all the macaroni and all the groats have been bought up. Things are not done this way, serious reforms are not prepared with such great haste as this regular programme has been prepared. In this way it is only possible to raze credibility towards yourself to the ground.

Incidentally, about credibility. A government which comes to the ruins of the economy and says: there is nothing doing, let us build together, let us strain ourselves, in principle, has a right to call upon the people to make the sacrifices to which they are now being called.

But when this is done by a government which has itself largely taken part in bringing about economic dislocation—its call for sacrifices cannot have a convincing ring.

And one more thing. The government's proposal to carry out a referendum on the question of prices seems absurd to me. The population's attitude towards this is absolutely clear. It will say "no" and the government will have to resign. If the government doesn't want to resign, why then organize a referendum? Or does anyone desire that the "no" to the administration's price hike should also sound like saying "no" to the very idea of transition to a market economy?

Problems of Economic Conversion Discussed

PM0706152690 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 22, 10-17 Jun 90 p 10

[Andrey Borodenkov article: "Uniformed Civilian Production"]

[Text] Sverdlovsk-Moscow—Everyone here discusses conversion. This is only to be expected. The last war turned the Urals into a giant military industrial complex. There are few people here who do not depend on lavish defence orders.

Percentage

The first signs of conversion showed in the Urals two years ago. The number of defence orders, however, started to decline only this year. It fell eight per cent in the Urals, which comprises five regions and two autonomous republics, exceeding the natioanl figure by nearly 50 per cent.

This doesn't seem much on the face of it. But one should know the value of this percentage in terms of money paid to each particular factory. Arms cost a lot everywhere. In our wasteful economy, given the fantastic generosity and uncontrolled nature of investments, products of the military industrial complex are indeed worth their weight in gold. Cut the output by one-tenth or even one-hundredth and the factory's budget will burst at the seams. It was only thanks to the emergency correction of output norms by the USSR State Planning Committee (Gosplan) that prevented social unrest. While the measures proved barely enough to ensure the stability of wages and bonuses (to do that three to four per cent of the staff has to be laid off each year), no money is there to maintain social and production development funds. That affects housing construction and holiday and daycare centres. It also affects people. Those leaving their jobs in the military industrial complex are the very people most needed for conversion—mainly scientists and researchers. Science was the first hit by the austerity programme.

According to Vladimir Vokkov, chairman of the Commission of the Sverdlovsk City Soviet for Industry and Conversion, nearly 30,000 researchers and highly qualified workers had to leave defence-related jobs in this city alone in the last two years. While such big centres as Sverdlovsk, Nizhaiy Tagil and Ufa can provide jobs (in cooperatives at least) for these people, what will people who live in smaller security-sensitive towns do when only one or two defence-related factories provide all the jobs available?

The problems confronting the Urals' defence industries are already great. This when only the first brick has been taken from their foundations. Plans call for dismantling defence production by nearly one-third by the end of the 13th Five-Year-Plan period. What will the situation be then? It is no accident that those running for local governments in the last elections won by a landslide because they raised the problem of conversion. One of them, Yuriy Samarin, elected mayor or Sverdlovsk, thinks that current problems result from the absence of a balanced programme to demilitarize industries.

Secretiveness

There is a draft of such a programme prepared by Gosplan and ministries involved in the defence complex, and it applies to the whole of the USSR. This February the government examined and rejected it. It has been revised and is now awaiting approval by the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers.

There are some impressive figures contained in the draft. The key figure is R110 billion. This is the value of consumer goods which has to be produced by the complex in five years in order to achieve a breakthrough. But the means to reach this figure is painfully familiar. All the ministries and defence factories are to be told what do produce and when. The Urals today serve as a proving ground for this illusory programme.

Factories with severely cut defence production are now expected to produce 50 per cent more consumer goods. Of course, they have been told what kind of goods. Those who used to make optical instruments will now manufacture machines packaging butter and sugar. Aircraft manufacturers have been told to make kitchen furniture. In the good old days no one cared if military products were somehow related to civilian production. Both kinds of goods were manufactured on orders even if it meant losses for the manufacturer. But now, having said yes sir, factory managers have asked the central authorities for supplies of resources (it's not a joke to step up production by 50 per cent) and have come up against a blank wall perhaps for the first time.

"Defence people are in the habit of getting everything on a platter the first time they ask for it," said Nikolay Sidelev, the man in charge of supplies to the Urals at Gosplan, explaining the new approach of the agency. "More than that, being classified, each enterprise regarded itself as independent. So in changed conditions they ask for supplies to enable the production of consumer goods. If they are supposed to manufacture toys they ask for equipment more suited to a chemical plant.

If we proceed like this, no amount of resources will be adequate. They'd better learn to be resourceful."

This policy was followed until recently in regard to civilian production factories. But the latter closely cooperate with other factories in relative freedom, allowing them in dire need to find partners and wangle resources out of thin air to meet production quotas. Not so with defence factories. Secrecy is a shield against all, even minimal, initiatives. How are they supposed to establish contacts and join hands if they are not supposed to know what the factory next door is doing.

About secrecy. It's paradoxical but the worst policy to understand defence production is to visit a factory. I visited a few and felt as if I was being taken around at the gun point. It takes forever to get a permit; you are escorted to the manager's office where you are confronted with wry smiles, sighs and helpless gestures. You can't ask them about their plans, profits, etc. You can't ask questions about production. Only back in Moscow and applying to top management could I get minimal information to give a picture of conversion in general terms.

They seemed to have realized the difficulties. They even suggested a way out. It consists essentially in establishing horizontal links between defence-related industries. Conversion causes lathes and assembly lines to stand idle. Instead of wasting time and money trying to equip each factory for the manufacture of, say bicycles, wouldn't it be wiser to pool the efforts of different plants?

The heads of defence factories in the Urals at the recent Gosplan meeting in Sverdlovsk liked the idea. But there should be some way of putting this into practice. This could be a centre of commerce and information which would keep tabs on all the resources being released by conversion, set up a data bank and offer its services in the search for partners. There are also proposals for cooperation between partners who would divide profits in accordance with the size of their shares. Those who put forward this idea think that the scheme could be set up throughout the Urals rather than being restricted to individual cities and regions.

The Armour's Strong

Five years ago this was out of the question. But with radical reforms close at hand these matters have to be tackled. How to produce consumer goods while being subordinate to defence authorities? How to be competitive, how to keep the workforce beyond the closely guarded gate when there is freedom to choose the kind of product you want to produce, to create flexible pay scales and employment conditions as opposed to the rigid quotas on personnel, tariffs, etc.? What to do about the ingrained high- handedness of government agencies? Are there guarantees that these associations are not going to become their victims?

It seems that Gosplan's main objective is to retain a command economy in the face of the impeding market economy. How can you then explain their stubborn refusal to partially take civilian production out of the control of the MIC [military-industrial complex], rejecting the idea that some of them could operate on a land-lease basis?

This is precisely what conversion at grassroots level is trying to accomplish. Spontaneously formed organizations in the Urals believe that demilitarization of their area spells the end of its economic bondage.

The head of one such organization, the Uralkonversiya Centre, Vyacheslav Safonov is convinced that conversion to civil production is counterproductive. He thinks that local government could buy the production facilities released from military production or they could be leased out to workers or retained by their former owners who have the control interest.

Everyone in the Urals discusses conversion. But is what is taking place conversion? Does it live up to our expectations? Defence scientists have been denied funds instead of being able to put their expertise to good use. Pots and pans being produced instead of high-tech. Trying to save funds ruins the whole idea.

It is perhaps the whole concept of switching the defence industry to civilian production which is at fault. The MIC is unwilling to fully convert some of the factories under the pretext that some of their facilities should be kept for a military emergency. The MIC would gradually decrease production. As a result, factories work at reduced capacity, labour productivity is declining, costs are climbing. But the worst part of it is that it is impossible to put the production lines, buildings and infrastructure to good use. thus civilian production has to be started from scratch instead of beating swords into ploughshares....

How much costlier is this kind of conversion? Remir Stepanov, Gosplan official, refused to answer this question. Don't ask me about these figures, I find them too disturbing, he said. He is right. In particular, the figures include the amounts that went to the defence industry in the form of subsidies. Yes, the industry's holes in the budget have been stopped and its personnel pacified. But it has not learned to earn its own upkeep. In the meantime this could have been done without much trouble when the country's rate of conversion averages five per cent. Our long-standing problems have now been aggravated by the danger of social unrest if conversion continues.

The Urals helped the country to win the war. Now we hope it will help us build a new economy. But will it be able to? It is more likely that it will help sustain the old one. At least while it is still in bondage to the MIC.

Draft RSFSR Economic Sovereignty Concept

904A0379A Moscow EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN in Russian No 21, May 90 pp 12-14

[Unattributed report: "Draft Concept of the Economic Sovereignty of the RSFSR"]

[Text] The concept of the economic sovereignty of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] was drawn up in accordance with the decision of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. It is based on wide-ranging scientific studies and takes account of the opinion of different strata of the community of the republic.

The basis of the concept is the provision of the USSR Constitution to the effect that the RSFSR is a sovereign state which has united with other republics in the USSR. The autonomous republics and autonomous formations are a part of the RSFSR on the basis of the free self-determination of the peoples and possess the plenitude of state power on their territory outside of the extent of the authority which they transfer to the charge of the USSR and the RSFSR.

The concept provides for the delineation of the authority of the USSR and the RSFSR in the economic sphere and the regulation of relations between them and determines the principles of their participation in the all-Union market.

Implementation of the concept is envisaged in two stages. At the first stage—1990-1991—there will be a broadening of the republic's rights and responsibility in the sphere of the control of socioeconomic processes on its territory (primarily thanks to a delineation of property between the USSR and the RSFSR) and a change in the procedure for the formation and utilization of the resources of the RSFSR state budget, and elements of an economic mechanism will be developed in accordance with the new system-forming laws.

At the second stage—as of 1992—the creation of an integral system of management for the entire national economic complex of the republic will be completed, transition to a planned-market economy will be accomplished and the bulk of the enterprises will emerge from departmental jurisdiction and acquire full economic independence.

1. General Provisions

The RSFSR has the exclusive right to dispose of its natural resources and economic, scientific and technical, and intellectual potential; to independently determine the directions, priorities, and scale of the development of the productive forces and a rise in the population's living standard; and to voluntarily establish equal, mutually profitable economic relations with the USSR, the other republics and foreign states.

The economic basis of the sovereignty of the RSFSR is its ownership of the land, natural, material, and financial resources, and production and nonproduction facilities (except for those pertaining, upon agreement with the republic, to the ownership of the USSR).

Different forms of ownership authorized by legislation: state (Union, republic, municipal), collective, cooperative, and mixed (with foreign countries or companies) and private operate equally on the basis of competition on the territory of the RSFSR.

Facilities owned by the USSR, the other Union republics, foreign states and their legal entities and citizens may be located on the territory of the RSFSR on a contract basis. The republic guarantees legal protection of all types of property.

The economic independence of the RSFSR, the autonomous republics and the autonomous formations is built on the principles of federalism, self-government and self-financing, and mutual commitments and responsibility between the RSFSR, the USSR, and the other republics and autonomous formations.

The strengthening of economic independence is designed to ensure:

the harmonious development of all the nations and nationalities residing on the territory of the RSFSR, the preservation and multiplication of their cultural and spiritual heritage, and the all-around development of the personality;

an increase in the quality of life of all social groups of the population and the creation of a system of social safeguards (primarily for the elderly, invalids, and students);

solution of the food and housing programs, saturation of the consumer market with goods and services and a strengthening of the material and technical facilities of health care, education, and culture;

restoration and maintenance of an ecologically clean environment and the rational use of nature;

an intensification of production and its increased efficiency based on the introduction of the achievements of scientific and technical progress;

an improvement of the structure of the RSFSR national economy, with the priority development of sectors of the social complex;

the rational location of the productive forces and the comprehensive development of national and administrative-territorial formations, the elimination of the unjustified differences in the living conditions of the population of individual territories and the smoothing over of regional socioeconomic disproportions.

2. Salient Features of the RSFSR's Socioeconomic Development—Objective Basis for a Broadening of the Republic's Economic Independence

The RSFSR possesses strong natural, economic, scientific and technical, demographic, and intellectual potential.

The preponderance of all-Union reserves of fuel and power, mineral and raw material, forest, land, and water resources is concentrated and more than half the population resides on its territory. The republic accounts for approximately two-thirds of the USSR's national product and more than 80 percent of the country's total currency proceeds. A substantial amount of Russia's potential is used for the accomplishment of all-Union tasks.

For a long time the economy of the RSFSR has been oriented chiefly toward the accomplishment of all-state tasks: industrialization, creation of the material and technical base, a strengthening of defense, increase in raw material potential, and so forth. Supplying Union stocks with the bulk of the oil and gas and their derivatives, cement, timber products, chemical industry products, and ferrous and nonferrous metals, it has been of key significance in the country's single national economic complex and the all-Union territorial division and cooperation of labor and has performed a consolidating role in the federation of Union republics.

Approximately three-fourths of the republic's industrial potential is under Union jurisdiction. The structure of the RSFSR national economy has been deformed because of the inordinate overloading with capital-intensive sectors of heavy, including extractive, industry and has been oriented extremely inadequately toward satisfaction of the population's requirements. Under the conditions of the current pricing system this structure fails to secure equivalent exchange with the other Union republics and reduces the proportion of the RSFSR's national income for the accomplishment of the republic's social tasks.

The RSFSR is in last place among the Union republics in terms of the proportion of national income spent on social needs.

3. Economic Relations of the RSFSR With the USSR and the Other Union Republics

The economic relations of the RSFSR with the USSR and the other Union republics are organized on the basis of the Union treaty. They are geared to an improvement in the social division of labor, optimization of territorial-economic relations based on equivalent and mutually profitable exchange, a strengthening of the country's national economic complex and a strengthening of friendship between the USSR peoples.

The RSFSR and the autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs independently decide questions of the location of production and economic facilities and provide for comprehensive economic and social and cultural development on their territory with regard for the interests of all the peoples residing there. On questions of the use of labor resources and protection of the environment the republics determine the conditions of the activity of the enterprises, establishments, and organizations belonging to the USSR and the other Union and autonomous republics in accordance with legislative enactments of the USSR and Union and autonomous republics.

The economic independence of the RSFSR and its autonomous and other administrative-territorial formations is guaranteed by laws of the USSR and the RSFSR and the Union treaty. Upon violation of these laws by the USSR, the republic has the right in the established procedure to lodge an appeal against enactments contrary to its economic interests and to suspend them.

The republic participates in the solution of economic and social questions of all-state and interrepublic significance and the exercise of all-state functions (defense, customs, and development of the national economic infrastructure and supply systems). Its participation in the accomplishment of these tasks is ensured through the quotas of all-Union programs and the system of supplies of products and services for all-Union needs and the food tax.

The RSFSR's economic relations with the other Union republics are organized on the principles of mutually profitable and equal cooperation. They are regulated by bilateral and multilateral agreements on a contract basis.

The RSFSR's relations with the other Union republics are characterized by two levels.

The first level includes direct (contract) relations of the enterprises located on RSFSR territory with enterprises located in other Union republics. The RSFSR contributes to the creation of the conditions for the incorporation of enterprises and territories in a system of interregional economic relations. These conditions are determined by the corresponding tax, budget, and credit policy. The RSFSR monitors the activity of the enterprise and regions from the viewpoint of its correspondence to current legislation.

The second level encompasses contracts which the RSFSR independently concludes with the other Union republics. In accordance with these agreements, the RSFSR enlists enterprises located on its territory and, if this proves more efficient, outside it also. The RSFSR contributes to the development of joint economic facilities, associations, and consortia within the framework of integration of the republic's efforts for the solution of common socioeconomic problems.

The RSFSR's economic relations with the USSR and the other Union republics regulated by contracts and agreements provide for the parties' mutual responsibility for nonfulfillment and inappropriate fulfillment of commitments and the application of the appropriate penalties, including restitution for damage and loss, and also removal of the negative consequences.

4. Financial Independence of the Republic and the Strengthening of Its Budget and Credit System

The RSFSR independently forms and utilizes its financial base, which is composed of resources of the republic state budget, extra-budget funds, the resources of enterprises, associations, and organizations located on its territory, organs of territorial self-government and the population, bank credit, and other financial sources. Resources of other Union republics and the Union budget may be attracted on repayable terms and also on a contract basis.

The financial base, including the budgets of the republic and the autonomous and other administrative-territorial formations which are a part of it, is formed on the principles of the self-earning of resources and the obligatory financial participation of all enterprises, regardless of their departmental jurisdiction. Noninterference in the budget process of the republic and the autonomous and administrative-territorial formations is guaranteed.

Version 1

Budget revenue is formed with regard for reservation of revenue sources for the USSR and the RSFSR and payments into the republic budget of a certain amount of Union budget revenue at mutually agreed rates (the current method).

Version 2

Republic budget revenue is formed by entering into the budget all payments from the population and enterprises and organizations located on republic territory and contribution to the Union budget of a contracted amount for all-Union needs (common purse method).

Version 3

Republic budget revenue is formed by entering into the budget an agreed amount of the payments made by enterprises and organizations of Union jurisdiction and all payments from the population and subordinate enterprises and organizations and contribution to the Union budget of a contracted amount for all-Union needs (ownership principle method).

Formation of the revenue base of the budget of the RSFSR and the autonomous and administrative-territorial formations which are a part of it is based on a taxation policy pursued independently in the republic on the basis of legislation of the USSR, the RSFSR, and the autonomous republics on the principles of stability, equal load, obligation, and social justice. This policy should ensure concentration of the necessary resources for the accomplishment of the tasks of economic and social development at the disposal of the republic and the autonomous and administrative-territorial formations which are a part of it.

The RSFSR decides questions of the collection for its budgets of all-state taxes and mandatory payments on the basis of an agreement with the USSR. The amounts of the rates and the scale of the allowances in respect of these taxes and payments are differentiated on the basis of the structure of the economy of the territories, the level of development of the social sphere, the ecological situation, and the extent of social guarantees.

For the accelerated implementation of measures pertaining to the development of areas of the Far North, the Far East, and Siberia, environmental protection, the surmounting of the social lag of certain regions and the prevention and elimination of the consequences of accidents in the republic regional development, ecology, social, and also reserve and other funds are created with the participation of the USSR and the other republics.

Extra-budget funds may be created from the resources of the population and enterprises and also by way of the issuance of bonds, loans, lotteries, and the attraction of other sources to finance the socioeconomic development of territories in the republic.

Given continuation of the centralized control of the credit-monetary system and emission policy, a two-tier composition of the banking system is envisaged in the RSFSR: the RSFSR State Bank (RSFSR Gosbank) and its establishments locally (first level); an extensive network of commercial, cooperative, stock and other credit establishments (second level). The state specialized banks will gradually be transformed into commercial banks on a stock basis.

As an integral component of the common system of the USSR Gosbank, the RSFSR Gosbank is in its activity accountable to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. It pursues in the republic a common state monetary-credit and currency policy, contributes in every way possible to the stability of the purchasing power of the ruble and organizes interbank payments on the basis of a common republic banking computing system, licensing, and supervision and regulation of the activity of credit establishments of the second level for the purpose of ensuring the efficiency of the operation of the entire banking system in the republic.

The credit resources of the republic are formed from the banks' own capital, residual amounts in the accounts of enterprises, establishments, and organizations, and the citizens in banking establishments and money in the accounts of republic and local budgets, in interbank payments, and in accounts in the savings bank and also taxes at established rates on part of the resources of the commercial banks. Part of the credit resources of the RSFSR Gosbank is deducted in accordance with rates determined by agreement with the USSR to the USSR Gosbank for the all-Union fund for regulating credit resources and the centralized fund for extending credit to the national economy.

The RSFSR draws up consolidated credit and cash plans and regulates monetary circulation in accordance with USSR legislation.

Questions of price control are decided in the RSFSR independently on the basis of all-Union rates and regulations. Use is made to this end both of state stable (fixed) prices of the socioeconomically most important products, goods, and services and contract (market) prices determined by supply and demand.

5. Foreign Economic Activity of the Republic

The RSFSR engages in independent foreign economic activity, proceeding from the tasks of the republic's socioeconomic development, the structural reorganization of its economy and the acceleration of scientific and technical progress on the basis of extensive incorporation in the international division of labor and also a strengthening of relations with other countries, wit regard for the commitments stipulated in international treaties of the USSR and the agreement between the USSR and the RSFSR.

The republic has the right to conclude bilateral and participate in multilateral intergovernmental agreements and contracts on economic, scientific and technical, and other questions of international cooperation.

Pertaining to the jurisdiction of the RSFSR are:

the elaboration and implementation of the republic's foreign trade and currency-financial policy, including the creation on its territory of free-enterprise zones;

regulation of the foreign economic activity of all enterprises and organizations located on republic territory, including the licensing and quantitative regulation of export-import transactions;

realization of border and coastal trade and retail trade for foreign currency and international tourism on republic territory;

defense of the economic interests of the RSFSR and the autonomous republics and enterprises, organizations, and citizens of Russia overseas.

The economic relations of all participants in foreign economic relations located on the territory of the republic with the USSR, the RSFSR, autonomous republics, autonomous formations, and the local soviets of people's deputies are realized through the RSFSR state budget by way of taxation of currency proceeds and export and import taxes and deductions to the USSR of part of the currency earnings determined by contract.

The autonomous republics, autonomous formations, and local soviets of people's deputies organize foreign economic relations and participate in them on the principles of currency self-support. They stimulate enterprises' export activity, create conditions to attract foreign capital and form currency funds from deductions from the currency earnings of enterprises, associations, and organizations engaging in foreign economic activity and located on their territory. They have the right to create joint ventures. They organize border and coastal trade.

Republic and regional foreign economic organizations, associations for business cooperation with foreign countries, and multifunctional commercial houses operating on a stock basis and engaging in investment, commercial, and information activity may be formed in the RSFSR.

6. Independence in the Formation and Utilization of Material Resources

The RSFSR actively facilitates the development of new progressive forms of material and technical support for enterprises, associations and organizations: wholesale trade and the sale of merchandise through company stores, at fairs and auctions, and on the basis of direct relations between manufacturers and consumers, contributing in every possible way to the formation of a single all- Union market.

For the removal of monopoly trends infringing the interests of the consumers, strengthening interrepublic integration processes and forming an efficiently operating all-Union market the republic participates in the elaboration and realization of a system of economic and organizational-legal measures providing for compliance with the practice of economizing on resources, the maximum involvement in turnover of secondary resources and the development of economic competition between suppliers of products, and in the establishment of mutually profitable economic relations between producers, consumers, and the material and technical supply authorities, regardless of their departmental affiliation and territorial location.

Under the conditions of the republic's economic independence the main territorial administrations of the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] located on the territory of the RSFSR are transferred to the RSFSR Gossnab system.

At the initial stage of the transition to a market economy there will be a change in the functions and methods of work of the material and technical supply enterprises. A system of wholesale-brokerage firms, whose work will be concentrated on fulfilling commercial transactions and evaluating and economically influencing market conditions, will be created. They are to organize commodity exchanges, fairs, and other facilities of the market infrastructure and also engage in advertising, information and foreign trade activity.

7. Scientific and Technical Policy

The RSFSR independently implements measures pertaining to the development of science and an acceleration of scientific and technical progress in the republic. Within its jurisdiction come:

the formulation and implementation in spheres of the national economy within its jurisdiction of purposive scientific and technical policy;

determination of the priority directions of scientific research into most important problems;

coordination of research by scientific establishments and organizations and the higher school;

introduction of new technology, techniques, and materials with regard for the regional singularities of the development of the republic's productive forces;

organization of the higher educational institutions and the training, retraining, and improvement of specialist personnel;

international scientific and technical cooperation.

The organizing and coordinating role in the development of science and the shaping of scientific and technical policy is entrusted to the RSFSR Academy of Sciences which is being formed.

The centralized principle in the control of scientific and technical progress is combined with the development of self-management by means of the formation under the leadership of the local soviet authorities of programs of the territories' scientific and technical progress.

A market of scientific and technical ideas and developments is created to increase the efficiency of investments of resources in science and technology in the RSFSR. The basis of the market is composed of territorial commercial information service and engineering brokerage centers linked by a republic computer network.

A fundamentally new economic environment affording various organizational forms of scientific and technical activity equal rights and opportunities is developed to ensure the acceleration of scientific and technical progress in the RSFSR. It provides for the creation of a system of economic stimulation of production's receptivity to innovations through specific subsidies and compensation, preferential credit and tax advantages for enterprises undertaking retooling, and assimilating the manufacture of fundamentally new equipment and products.

The mechanism of management of scientific organizations is being reorganized. Its basis is composed of differentiated taxation, whereby the amount of profit depends not on the extent of the work performed and contract prices but on the quality of the developments and their social and economic significance for the republic (solution of ecological problems, comprehensive processing of raw material, and so forth).

To accelerate scientific and technical progress in the RSFSR an efficient and flexible system for the training, retraining, and improvement of personnel based on the extensive development of scientific and industrial training complexes and other progressive forms of tuition is created. It not only ensures for the republic national economy specialists in areas of the development of science and technology ensuing from the scientific and technical policy pursued in the RSFSR but also affords the new generations embarking on independent life opportunities for future vocational guidance. The training of personnel in higher and secondary specialized educational institutions and vocational-technical schools for other Union republics is undertaken on a contract basis.

The formation and strengthening of the new economic environment and the implementation of the new scientific and technical policy are undertaken by the RSFSR State Committee for Scientific and Technical Progress.

8. Investment Policy

Regulation of investment activity on the territory of the RSFSR is the exclusive prerogative of the republic. It has the exclusive right to approve normative documents, make expert appraisals and adopt final decisions in the sphere of capital construction.

The RSFSR and its autonomous and administrative-territorial formations determine the directions of the use of centralized capital investments and approve planning-estimates documents irrespective of the estimated cost of construction projects, make the decisions on questions of the preparation for and implementation of capital construction from other sources of financing, including extra-budget funds, and ensure the conditions for the creation of a contract market. Investors are guaranteed a choice of contract organizations on the basis of bidding and competition.

All investment actions on the territory of the RSFSR are exercised only with the consent of the corresponding republic and local organs of administration. Use is made here of tax methods of controlling enterprises' investment activity.

The extensive development of small businesses and organizations and construction cooperatives and leased enterprises, the creation on that basis of construction, planning-construction, and other firms and transition to bidding and competitions for contracts at the time of the planning and construction of facilities combined with the introduction of market relations are exercised for the purpose of eliminating the monopoly in construction.

The autonomous republic councils of ministers and the local soviet executive committees draw up on a contract basis the program of contract work following placement of the state commission.

Expenditure on the development and maintenance of the social infrastructure is borne by the local soviets of people's deputies in conjunction with the enterprises located on their territory and also with the attraction of the resources of the population.

Centralized capital investments are used to implement the most important national economic programs and equalize the economic and social development of individual territories. A system of protection of the population against natural disasters and ecological catastrophes is created in planned fashion from centralized capital investments.

9. Protection of the Environment and the Rational Use of Nature

On its territory the RSFSR exercises sovereign right to the possession and disposal of natural resources and ensures the rational use of nature through state administration and control, the formation of a scientific-information and normative base, organization of the monitoring of the environment, the creation of environmental protection facilities and specially protected territories (national parks, sanctuaries, reservations, and so forth) and recreational zones and the implementation of other measures in this field.

The republic pursues a uniform scientific and technical policy in the sphere of the use of nature. It decides questions of the right to use natural resources being granted state, cooperative, and other enterprises and organizations on the basis of contracts and exercises supervision of the compliance by all enterprises and organizations with the requirements of legislation of the USSR and the RSFSR on the conservation of nature and its rational use.

The planning and implementation of a set of environmental protection measures, by the efforts and resources of the users of nature included, establishment of the ecological safety provisions and the exercise of environmental protection activity on republic territory, determination of the limits and quotas of the use of nature, the granting of permits and imposition of prohibitions on enterprise and organization activity and also the practice of state ecological expert appraisal of programs of the location and development of the productive forces, sectors of the national economy, and projects for the construction of enterprises and other facilities will be within its jurisdiction.

The question of the construction of large national economy facilities or ecologically dangerous industries, which could by their activity damage the environment, is decided following expert ecological appraisal with regard for the opinion of the community in connection with the planned construction.

The republic and local environmental protection authorities have the right:

to impose bans on the construction, modernization, or expansion of industrial or other facilities and work on the exploitation of natural resources performed in violation of environmental protection legislation;

to suspend the work of industrial and other enterprises violating the standards and rules of environmental protection and creating a dangerous ecological situation;

to bring suit against enterprises and organizations and also Soviet and foreign citizens for compensation for damage caused by pollution of the environment and the irrational use of natural resources.

10. Control of Territorial Development

The RSFSR independently decides questions of the development and location of the productive forces for the purpose of the harmonious development of the regions and the RSFSR as a whole, the most efficient and rational use of material, labor, and financial resources, the preservation and improvement of the environment, and the republic's increased contribution to the national economic complex of the USSR.

The productive forces are developed and located on the basis of contract relations between the RSFSR, the USSR, and the other Union republics.

On the basis of the formulated concept the RSFSR pursues a regional economic policy providing for the fullest and most efficient use of the economic potential of all regions of the RSFSR.

The main directions of the development and location of the productive forces in the RSFSR in respect of economic areas, the European part and the Urals, Siberia and the Far East, the Non-Chernozem Zone of the RSFSR and the zone of the Baykal-Amur Main Railroad, the North, and the territorial-production complexes are determined by the republic and are binding on the entire system of proprietors, those of Union jurisdiction included.

The control of territorial development is based on a combination of centralized administration and local self-government.

The local soviets provide for the comprehensive economic and social development of the corresponding territories on the basis of the development of their own economic and financial base and the local economy and also the coordination of the economic activity of the associations, enterprises, and organizations under their jurisdiction located on their territories.

Leadership of enterprises and organizations of the agroindustrial complex, the production of consumer goods, the general amenities sphere, the industrial infrastructure of republic (ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]), kray, and oblast significance, the construction complex and environmental protection and other types of activity directly connected with the day-to-day life of the population is concentrated in the charge of the councils of ministers of the autonomous republics, autonomous formations, and local soviets of people's deputies.

The local soviets organize their economic activity on the basis of self-government and self-financing. They are accorded the right, within the limits of earned resources, to increase expenditure on the maintenance of health care, public education, cultural, social security, and sports establishments, to raise the guaranteed levels of social benefits, and to determine the expenditure on the maintenance of the organs of power and administration. They may form currency funds from their own income from foreign economic activity and also from taxes on the corresponding funds of the enterprises and organizations located on their territory.

Within the bounds of their jurisdiction the local soviets adopt measures pertaining to the regulation of the price of products, goods and services produced and consumed on the corresponding territory, create the economic conditions for saturation of the domestic consumer market and organize work to improve the planning and use of credit resources. They determine the procedure and effect the transition of cities and rayons to the principles of self-government and self-financing.

The local soviets of all levels exercise leadership in the use of labor resources on the corresponding territory, decide in conjunction with the enterprises and the work force questions of employment and population, and devise and implement programs of training and utilization of personnel, charging for the use of labor resources here. They stimulate the export activity of the enterprises, create conditions for the attraction of foreign capital, and actively contribute to the conversion of industries and the development of mutually profitable relations with the other Union republics.

To fuller realize the rights and interests of the republic and the autonomous and territorial formations which are a part of it, the functions of the regulation of economic and social development are allocated among organs of state administration of the RSFSR and the organs of territorial (local) self-government.

The RSFSR Council of Ministers contributes in every possible way to the creation of a variety of territorial associations forming by voluntary association administrative-territorial formations of the RSFSR for the independent solution of important territorial problems confronting simultaneously a number of administrative formations (an association of autonomous republics and oblasts of the Volga region for maintaining the ecosystem of the Volga, for example, Baykal and northern territories' formations and so forth). Program projects realized by an association are financed from the local budgets of the territories incorporated in the association, from republic state budget resources and others.

The city of Moscow, which performs the functions of capital of the RSFSR, together with the rights of all the autonomous and territorial formations, concludes contracts with the republic government on compensability for services rendered.

For the effective realization of the potential of market and planned regulation the RSFSR independently forms a system of control of the republic economy and determines the composition, structure, and functions of its authorities, the strength of the personnel and expenditure on its maintenance; staffs of authorized persons of the RSFSR Council of Ministers are created at the regional level in all major economic areas of the RSFSR.

11. Control of the RSFSR's Socioeconomic Development

Control of the development of the republic's national economy is based on the use of plan and market regulators providing for an increase in the efficiency of the use of the RSFSR's economic potential, an accelerated upturn in the living standard of the republic population, full satisfaction of its commodity and service requirements, and an increase in the efficiency of the republic's participation in the intra-Union and international division of labor.

A priority direction for improvement in the economic mechanism is the gradual development of a system of controlled market relations.

The RSFSR forms and develops producer goods, consumer goods, manpower, and securities markets.

The market form of economic activity in the RSFSR is based on recognition of the full independence of the enterprises and organizations in the choice of directions and the nature of production and commercial activity.

Enterprises' relations with the organs of administration are based on the principles of the legal equality of the economic partnership and are regulated by the contracts which have been concluded.

While providing for the development of the market, the organs of administration of the RSFSR actively accept the goal-oriented subsidizing of the activity of individual enterprises and organizations and social and other specific programs.

To avoid negative processes in the development of the market the republic and local soviets implement measures of an anti-monopoly nature. The stimulation of competition and the formation of an efficiently operating producer goods, raw materials, and intermediate products market are realized through a sharp reduction in the amount of funded distribution, the expansion of wholesale trade, the creation of company stores, the organization of fairs and auctions, and so forth.

Under the conditions of developing the market economy the RSFSR exerts, together with indirect regulation, a direct influence on certain spheres and sectors of the national economy with the aid of planning direct centralized investments and limit-fixing and distribution of material resources.

The RSFSR State Plan determines the goals and priorities of the economic and social development of the republic and its regions. The state plan reflects the republic's structural policy. State commissions for the production and supply of individual types of product and service and the commissioning of production capacity and facilities of the social sphere are determined in the plans for the accomplishment of the set tasks of the republic's economic and social development.

There is an appreciable change in the principles of formation of the state commission here. First, it will be reduced from year to year, second, distribution of the entire product manufactured on RSFSR territory is to satisfy primarily the requirements of the Union and republic state commissions, while the remainder is transferred to the free market.

The following are recognized as the main directions of economic and social development:

Accomplishment of the Food Program:

implementation of economic reform for the purpose of strengthening the independence of the basic production component with the exclusion of interference in its operational-economic activity;

introduction of new land legislation enshrining a diversity of forms of ownership and management (kolkhoz-sovkhoz [collective farm and state farm] enterprises, tenant organizations, tenant collective cooperatives, peasant farms, the citizens' personal subsidiary plots), the creation of a developed network of food exchanges and wholesale trade enterprises and the organization of regular fairs;

within the framework of the market infrastructure the development of purchasing and sales cooperatives and intermediary enterprises engaging in the purchase, storage, and sale of farm products, proceeding from supply and demand on a particular territory;

establishment of a food tax on farm products and raw material;

strengthening of the material-technical facilities of the agro-industrial complex with the elimination of the structural disproportions in its development;

the assured priority of the agro-industrial complex in investment policy.

Program of Saturation of the Consumer Market:

expansion of economic relations in respect of the exchange of consumer goods between regions on a contract basis;

economic stimulation of the manufacture of equipment for light, textile and food industry, trade, and consumer service;

reprofiling of a considerable number of enterprises, of the defense and mechanical engineering complex included, for the production of consumer goods, primarily fundamentally new and intricate durables.

Housing Program:

gradual transition from the allocation of housing built from centralized capital investments to its being earned preferentially by the work force and individual citizens, given preservation of state support and privileges for socially unprotected groups of the population;

improvement and regulation of the use and maintenance of housing, bearing in mind maximum assurance of the principle of social justice and a reduction in state expenditure;

the accelerated construction of apartment houses in the Far East, Siberian, and Northern regions;

solution of the problem of accommodating the Russian-speaking refugees from other Union republics and the resettlement of individual nationalities in their historical places of residence;

elimination in Bryansk, Smolensk, and Tula Oblasts of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station;

stimulation of the development of municipal facilities, the comprehensive development of accommodations and their increased provision with conveniences.

The transition to a controlled market economy within the framework of RSFSR sovereignty will objectively have both positive and negative socioeconomic consequences.

Negative Consequences:

the emergence in the initial period of the reorganization of the structure of the national economic complex of an officially recognized group of persons not engaged in production (in this connection the organs of administration of the republic should adopt preemptive measures pertaining to the retraining and requalification of personnel and regulation of the intersectoral redistribution of manpower);

a recession, primarily in certain sectors of group "A" and industrial construction (under these conditions the most important economic relations should be supported by directive and enterprise and personal initiative encouraged and developed);

stratification of the population by income and material sufficiency. A temporary decline in the living standard is possible for a certain part of the population as a consequence of the increase in retail prices (there will be an easing of the impact of market relations by means of state support for the needy categories of the population, financial, and credit policy and a rational taxation system).

Positive Consequences:

neutralization of the destabilizing factors of the economy manifested in the extension of intersectoral disproportions, the deterioration of the financial situation and the imbalance of the consumer market;

a halt to nonequivalent redistribution through the Union bodies of the natural, material, and financial resources of the RSFSR. The establishment of real prices for fuel, raw material, timber, and metal. The surmounting of nonequivalent, pooled interrepublic exchange which undermines Russia's economic base, increases the process of the working people's alienation from the results of labor and engenders dependent sentiments;

structural reorganization of the economy in favor of the consumer sector, which will create a practicable basis for the fulfillment of social food, consumer goods, housing, health care, and cultural programs. Normalization of the consumer market in respect of the majority of goods and services will lead to a halt in speculative demand and hoarding and the disappearance of lines. This, in turn, will eliminate the basis for speculation and the "shadow economy." The manufacture of products not in demand will cease, and material resources will be released;

a sharp increase in the economic motivation of labor activity, economies in resources, an increase in product quality and the use of the most efficient forms of management. There will be a reorientation and the shaping of the stable interest of each worker in the end results of labor activity.

As the incentives to highly productive labor strengthen, a growth in production in the socially significant sectors and, on this basis, a rise in the living standard will begin.

12. Social Protection of the Population

The RSFSR assumes responsibility for the social protection of the population residing on its territory and creates the economic and legal possibilities for the realization of a strong social policy. Each citizen of the RSFSR is assured observance of the most important social rights, including the right to labor, a guaranteed minimum wage, health care, and training and retraining in accordance with society's requirements.

The RSFSR ensures the effective employment of the population, regulates the creation of jobs on republic territory, forms republic and local "employment funds" geared to the payment of benefits to citizens who have been released and who have not been provided with work, the financing of public works, the development of the population's vocational guidance and the creation of new jobs, and forms a republic employment service.

By way of granting privileges pertaining to taxation and the payment for labor resources, the republic regulates the employment of women, the youth, and invalids thanks to the creation of jobs, the development of work in the home, and the use of flexible working hours.

The RSFSR pursues an active demographic policy, determines a system of measures aimed at optimization of population reproduction processes, the rationalization of migration flows and the creation of the conditions for the admittance and employment of citizens who have been forced to abandon their places of permanent residence and regulates the distribution and redistribution of manpower. It makes decisions on the attraction to the RSFSR of labor resources from other Union republics and foreign manpower and determines differentiated payment for labor resources with regard for territorial and sectoral singularities.

Fixed or upper-limit retail prices are determined in the republic in respect of socially significant consumer goods, the state commission for the production of these commodities is honed and other levers and stimuli are employed for the purpose of social protection of the population.

The republic ensures the minimum wage, pensions and other types of social support determined by USSR legislation, independently draws up a minimum consumer budget (minimum wage) and optimum consumer budget in respect of different regions of the republic with regard for natural-climatic and national-territorial singularities and on this basis makes adjustments to the minimum wage, pension, grant and benefit.

The republic determines the maximum duration of work time, the minimum amount of leave, and other social guarantees. Here the minimum level is raised thanks to and within the limits of the resources at the disposal of the republic, regions and enterprises.

The minimum consumer budgets are determined and officially approved with regard for the proposals of the autonomous republics, autonomous formations, krays, and oblasts, and the population is regularly notified of this.

A mechanism for the protection of the population's income against inflation and price rises is created in the republic. The minimum wage, social insurance, and social security payments, grants and so forth are adjusted with a change in the cost-of-living index.

The RSFSR pursues an active social policy providing for consideration of the interests of all groups and strata of society and the nations and nationalities inhabiting the republic and geared to provision of the population with food, goods and services, and housing, protection of man's health and the growth of spiritual and physical potential. The protection of elderly citizens living alone and invalids is realized in the republic by way of full satisfaction of the need for residential homes, an increase in the diet norms and medical services. Programs financed from republic and local budgets, social funds and resources of enterprises and the population are drawn up and realized for this purpose at the republic and local levels.

Economic sovereignty means primarily the creation of the legal and economic basis for the purpose of ensuring the true absolute power of the soviets of people's deputies of the republic, the extensive democratization of management, and the development of the political and economic foundations of local self-government.

Equalizing for all republics the conditions of the formation of financial resources, including a change in the system of pricing and the transition in relations between republics to uniform world prices. Russia's sovereignty will considerably increase Russia's rights in the economic sphere. Economic sovereignty is in itself a system of the redistribution of rights and duties in the sphere of material resources, products, and finances, but its purpose is the creation of the conditions for independent, normal management whereby whoever works more should obtain more, and the protection of those in need of social protection.

Russia's economic sovereignty will make it possible to speak in earnest of the technical modernization of production and to form a structure for this which is oriented primarily toward man, toward Russians themselves. To produce more and ourselves fairly distribute consumer goods, construction materials, currency resources—all that we produce and possess.

It will be possible to initiate broad-based programs for an improvement in working conditions and ecological recovery in order that each Russian have the right to clean water and clean air.

Economic sovereignty precludes the commanding of the enterprises and cooperatives located on its territory. Our task is to create normal conditions for management through taxes, licensing, republic purchases, and other economic levers.

What will the social impact of Russia's economic sovereignty be? Calculations show that at the first stage even Russia has to increase its budget by approximately R35 billion, that is, by more than one-fourth. The republic will, correspondingly, be able to increase investments in health care, education, social support for the family, and the development of municipal services and the agro-industrial complex. This impact will be felt by each Soviet family and each worker, engineering-technical employee, and office worker and business manager, and soviet leader.

Having obtained additional resources, the Russian parliament and the local soviets will acquire an opportunity to expand the program of social support for the family thanks to an expansion of the network of preschool establishments, of a convalescent profile included, extend material assistance to young families through the granting of credit and one-time assistance and increase subsidies to large families. Instead of vast centers for teaching 1,500-2,000 children, it might finally be possible to build normal schools for 400-500 children with classes in which each child is visible and where it is possible to display an individual approach and really cultivate the personality.

The numerous discussions concerning the family doctor and a system of preventive work could finally be transferred to the level of implementation, special attention being paid to the protection of mother and child. Russia's economic sovereignty will create real prerequisites for an improvement in the material base of health care and the increased level of its scientific content. Russia will gain an opportunity to improve the provision of the population with medication.

Additional investments in housing and municipal facilities and services will help initiate mass housing construction, maintain housing in better condition, improve the provision of localities with amenities, and build additional stores and various service enterprises, which will help women primarily.

The economic sovereignty of Russia will exert an appreciable influence on the income and work conditions of each person, be he worker, kolkhoz member or specialist. The transfer of Russian enterprises to equal conditions with the enterprises of other republics will enable them to reserve a larger part of profits for the solution of problems of the retooling of production, the realization of social programs and an improvement in the material stimulation of their workmen. It will be possible to really provide incentives for those who work more and better, finally pay the workers for their labor in full and pursue in practice a policy of social justice.

With the acquisition of economic sovereignty it will be possible to begin also the realization of a program of the genuine revival of the Russian countryside. A revival by building roads, the adoption of measures to produce fundamentally new equipment and technology for the republic's agro-industrial complex, including tenants, individual farmers and agricultural cooperatives, and the rendering of the utmost assistance in individual housing construction.

And, finally, economic sovereignty is geared to the creative and democratic solution of the question of the self-determination of the peoples of the republic. The fullness of power on their territories is transferred to the autonomous republics and autonomous formations. The necessary conditions will be created for each nation of Russia for free development in order that it may in practice be an equal among equals.

Agricultural

Ligachev Comments on Swedish Agro-Industry

LD1006200990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 10 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev's visit to Sweden has ended. He gave an interview to our correspondent on the results of his trip.

[Begin Ligachev recording] Studying the development of the agro-industrial complex, the cooperative movement, and social policy in Sweden, I can already voice several considerations. First: We have once again been convinced that we must engage thoroughly in diversity of forms of farming. We have studied the work of private farms here. Yes, we have noticed, of course, that Swedish farmers frequently work 12 or 14 hours, and often they have no days off. But we couldn't fail to notice something else too: The Swedish farmer's level of technical equipment is significantly better than that of our peasant. Therefore, the first conclusion that we are drawing is that we must continue to equip workers in the agroindustrial complex technically and to provide for them socially.

Second: We have noticed that, with the aim of full employment of the working or, as they say, the self-employed population, a very interesting system of job placement and professional retraining has come about in Sweden. A ramified network has been established in this sphere. You can judge for yourselves. We have been told that the working population in Sweden is approximately 4 million. Last year more than 500,000 passed through these centers overall. Incidentally, they are financed both by the state budget and on the basis of financially autonomous relations and self-financing. We have had quite wide-ranging contacts of a political nature here, in particular with the Swedish leaders, the Prime Minister Carlsson and the Riksdag Speaker Peterson. I shall not conceal that we are pleased that they expressed kind words about relations between the Soviet Union and Sweden and that, in their opinion, the development of these relations is on the rise, especially in the economic scientific, and cultural spheres.

I cannot fail to point out this interesting fact: Yesterday we visited the Royal Library and I shall tell you that we were very touched by the care and attention displayed by the Swedish—let us say—comrades to the historical fact that Vladimir Ilyich Lenin visited that library. We are gladdened, simply, I would say, by such an attitude to V.I. Lenin. I wish to mention this also because in some countries in East Europe, and in some of our union republics for that matter, there have recently been many manifestations, I would say, of vandalism against Vladimir Ilyich Lenin's memory, and it seems to me that it is our moral duty to raise a voice of protest against the desecration of Lenin's memory as the founder of our state and as the founder of our party. [end recording]

Farm Chairman Cited on 'Burden' of State Order

PM0706092590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 5 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by I. Dvorkin and G. Shalabayev, identified by caption]

[Text] [Newscaster] Sowing is drawing to a close in the Kazakh virgin lands. Self-financing farms in Kustanay Oblast are working in what must be the most difficult weather and economic conditions.

On the one hand, bureaucratic restrictions in the shape of the plan and diktat have diminished, but on the other hand, despite recent government decisions, less care is being shown for the countryside, as our correspondents have found out.

[Correspondent] The ultimate measure of farmers' work and ingenuity is, of course, the harvest. However, in [Kustanay Oblast's] Kamyshinskiy Rayon the completion of the spring sowing campaign within the optimum deadlines is already an achievement.

The changes began with the arrival of Viktor Ivanovich Dorozhko at the party rayon committee and his support for enterprising leaders.

The "Voroshilovskiy" Sovkhoz [state farm] can serve as an example. Zh.K. Kudaykulov has been the farm's director for the past few years. He was responsible for the restoration of the brickworks. Old houses have been repaired and new ones constructed. A television relay station has been constructed. People receive both central and republic television programs. A stadium, store, and kindergarten have been built. A doomed village—Okan—has been revived. People have put their trust in the changes, but clearly their goodwill alone is not enough.

[Sovkhoz Chairman Zh.K. Kudaykulov, identified by caption] To tell you the truth, during the period of stagnation I worked as a sovkhoz chairman for 11 years, and we lived better than now. The plan at that time was lower than what we now describe as the state order. Supplies of machinery and fertilizer and supplies to the population in general were considerably better and cheaper than at present. The state order is a great burden. It is impossible, in practice, to resolve all questions because resources are lacking. Meanwhile the state is putting pressure on us, demanding grain, demanding meat, demanding milk, demanding wool. Where is it all to come from? You saw for yourselves the land on which we are sowing. Scientists from Moscow and Alma-Ata have been here. They analyzed the soil and came to the conclusion that it is virtually impossible to use this land for sowing.

[Correspondent] The situation will probably be alleviated by the new prices. The purchase price for wheat is trebling. That sounds advantageous. However, in the republic as a whole this is fraught with the threat that for the sake of profit farmers will switch to grain growing at the expense of livestock breeding. Some farms are already expanding their grainfields, despite unfavorable climatic conditions.

Thriving Kolkhoz in Ukraine Examined

PM0806152590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 7 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: report by Yu. Roshchin, identified by caption]

[Text] [Newscaster] Kolkhozes [collective farms] have come in for so much criticism lately that the term "kolkhoz" has almost become a term of abuse. Nonetheless, there are kolkhozes, and there are quite a few of them in the country, which produce excellent output, earn a lot of money, and know how to spend it for the benefit of the people. You are about to see a report from Tomakovskiy Rayon in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast. According to our correspondent, not a kilogram of locally grown vegetables and fruit has perished here in the last 10 years.

[Correspondent] All fruit and vegetables that is not sold fresh is processed by the "Progress" specialized kolkhoz. Last year alone almost 10 tonnes of vegetables, fruit, and berries were preserved here. Any well-organized business produces good profit. This highly profitable enterprise now has some R3 million in the bank. The main items of the kolkhoz's expenditure are social, cultural, and everyday needs. In recent years more than 60 spacious new three- and four-room houses with all amenities have been constructed here. There is practically no waiting list for housing on the farm.

This is canning shop operator Nikolay Kazimirovich Levandovskiy. Recently he has moved into this new four-room house. [video shows young man in front of new house, interior of house]

[Correspondent] Tell me, how much rent do you pay?

[Levandovskiy] I pay R9.80 per month. That is for some 70 square meters of floor space. All this was done with kolkhoz money. I did not invest a kopek. Everything, the heating, gas supply, and I even have a telephone, has been paid for by the kolkhoz.

[Correspondent] Between seasons, when cannery production lines are not operating, kolkhoz members change their main jobs and become bricklayers, plasterers, carpenters, and tile layers. The kolkhoz generously shares its profits with the kindergarten, school, and rayon hospital. Mikhail Nikolayevich Maksimushin, a war veteran, retired long ago. Nonetheless, the kolkhoz administration pays him annually R250 on top of his pension, just like 70 other kolkhoz veterans. In view of the care lavished on kolkhoz members, people willingly join the "Progress" Kolkhoz. Average wages are R250 per month, with a guaranteed eight-hour day even at peak times.

Agricultural Developments For 24 May-6 Jun

LD0706042790

[Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Rusian on 24 May-6 June, unless indicated otherwise. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parenthesis at the end of each item.

24-27 May

No significant developments reported.

28 May

In the Altay, the sowing of beet has finished. The sowing of potatoes is also finishing. (1100)

The hay-making has started in Kirghizia. Three of four harvests of alfalfa and sainfoin are planned to be collected over the summer. (1100)

29-30 May

No significant developments reported.

31 May

Sowing of wheat in Tselinogrd Oblast covering 3.4 million ha has been completed. (Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 0100 GMT)

1-2 June

No significant developments reported.

3 June

Kazakhstan: Sowing of wheat is completed, occupying 12.6 million ha. (Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT)

4-5 June

No significant developments reported.

6 June

Corn sowing has been completed in Altay Kray. Kursk beet growers plan to send 3,750,000 tonnes to refineries this year. Drought and dust storms are holding back field work in Buryatia; wheat and rye sowing ended a fortnight later than usual. (1300)

Scientific

Further Reportage on 'Kristall-Mir' Docking

Ground Control 'Optimistic'

LD0806152890 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Specialists at the Soviet Ground Control Center are optimistic about the outcome of the second attempt to dock the technological module, Kristall, with the Mir orbital station. They studied telemetric information and found the reason why the automatic devices stopped the planned link-up on Wednesday. Ground Control says that after the flight path of the module was corrected the best variant of further moves has been established. The 20- tonne technological module is to link up with the Mir station on Sunday.

'Kristall' Orbit Corrected

LD0906090490 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] The delay in docking the technological module Krystall to the orbital station Mir does not worry experts at the flight monitoring center. The docking was postponed on Wednesday because of mishaps at one of the engines in Krystall's orientation system.

The module is equipped with extra engines, which were switched on on Saturday to rectify the flight. The module has enough fuel for two more docking operations. Another attempt to dock is scheuled for Sunday.

Rendezvous Maneuver Executed

LD0906100390 Moscow TASS in English 0941 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondent reporting from Mission Control Center]

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS—Anatoliy Solovyov and Aleksandr Balandin continue their work on board the Mir orbital scientific and research complex. They have carried out another series of experiments to assess the influence of outer space on structural materials' physical and mechanical characteristics.

According to the medical control plan, the cosmonauts' cardiovascular system was thoroughly tested. They carried out the "sport" experiment to determine optimal regimes for physical training in conditions of a long-term stay in weightlessness.

According to the Kristall module flight programme, the module executed another rendez-vouz manoeuvre at 10:34, Moscow time, today and is to dock with the Mir complex on June 10.

Docking Occurs 10 Jun

LD1006144890 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 10 Jun 90

[by TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow June 10 TASS—The Kristall module docked with the manned complex Mir today. Two additional corrections of the module's trajectory of movement had been made on June 7 and 9.

Mutual search, rendezvous, tethering and docking were carried out automatically and were controlled by the mission control centre, as well as cosmonauts Anatoly Solovyov and Aleksandr Balandin.

The module blasted off from the Baykonur launch site on May 31. Originally, it was scheduled to dock up with Mir on June 6. But, the docking was put off because a computer had pinpointed a malfunction in one of the engines of the module's orientation system. The launch of the Kristall module had also been postponed several times.

The introduction of a third module to the Mir orbital complex will considerably expand the programme of scientific and technological experiments.

The Kristall module has five installations to carry out experiments in material science and the production of high quality semi-conductor materials and metallic alloys for contemporary microelectronics.

Biotechnical experiments also form an important part of the research programme. They include experiments to attain crystals from biological substances and cellous cultures and manufacture biologically active products with preset properties for use in medicine and other branches of the national economy, as well as experiments to develop a method of making new highly-effective medical preparations in conditions of weightlessness.

The module has the Glazar-2 ultra-violet telescope with onboard guidance, a complex spectrometers to carry out astrophysical experiments and the Priroda-5 photo equipment for taking photos of the earth's surface.

Experiments on further cultivation of plants in conditions of a space flight will be carried out in the space greenhouse Svet produced in Bulgaria.

The total weight of the space system "Mir-Quant-Quant-2-Kristall-Soyuz TM-9" is 83 tonnes.

The Kristall module will be redocked to a new place on June 11.

Data About Chlorine Leak Possibly 'Concealed'

LD0906155590 Helsinki International Service in Finnish 1500 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Nikolay Vorontsov, chairman of the Soviet State Committee for the Protection of the Environment, considers it possible information about the possible chlorine leak in the Kola Peninsula last month has been concealed. Vorontsov himself has not received any information about the alleged accident in Monchegorsk. Vorontsov said today in Lappeenranta [southeastern Finland] that it is possible Moscow has not been given the information. Information about the Kola accident has been published in a newspaper published in Soviet Karelia.

New Passenger Catamaran Completes Sea Trials

LD0606104390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Announcer-read report over video from Arkhangelsk, from the "Teletype" feature of the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A passenger catamaran has successfully completed a trial run in the White Sea. This is the first of a new type of vessel to join the passenger fleet. The catamaran was constructed for northern sea crossings.

The completely automated systems, including autopilot and two closed-circuit television systems, help ensure safety at sea. [video shows "Solovki" catamaran at sea]

AIDS Conference Predicts Epidemic 'in 5 Years'

PM0706184890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[A. Kucher report: "Epidemic Can Be Expected in Five Years"]

[Text] Leningrad—The first All-Union Scientific and Practical Conference on "The Prevention of and Struggle Against AIDS in the USSR" has taken place in Leningrad.

The conference was organized by the USSR Health Ministry, the Leningrad Main Health Administration, and the Leningrad S.M. Kirov Institute of Advanced Medical Training. Leningrad, as is well known, was one of the first cities in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] to open a center for combating AIDS and a specialized clinic.

"A mass epidemic of the '20th-century plague' is expected in our country, unfortunately, in five years' time," A. Rakhmanova, Leningrad's chief infectious diseases specialist, says. "But many people stubbornly refuse to understand that."

Today the disease, which is as yet incurable, has been recorded in 156 countries. The total number of sufferers is 254,078. In terms of the number of AIDS sufferers our country is nowhere near the leader in Europe as yet. Some 497 Soviet citizens are infected with the virus. The largest number in Rostov-na-Donu. Then come Kalmykia, Volgograd, Moscow, and Leningrad. Several patients have already died.

"We should devote the maximum possible attention to material provision, preventive services, and diagnostic tools. We are hoping to cooperate with the British firm 'Wellcome,' whose experts are also taking part in the conference," A. Rakhmanova noted.

Military

Military Chiefs Win CPSU Congress Places

PM0706100790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Nonstaff correspondent A. Khramtsov report under the rubric "In Party Organizations": "Elected Delegates"]

[Text] Severomorsk (Murmansk Oblast), 6 Jun—A party conference of the Red Banner Northern Fleet has completed its work here. It discussed questions of enhancing the role of fleet communists in resolving the tasks facing Northern Fleet servicemen and democratizing internal party life and elected eight delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. They include Admiral F.N. Gromov, commander of the fleet; Lieutenant General V.G. Deyneka, commander of the air arm; Warrant Officer I.G. Kozulkin; and Rear Admiral A.G. Selivanov, chief of the Fleet Political Directorate.

'Victimization' of Reform Advocates Protested

PM0506133990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 p 1

[Feature comprising letter to D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister, from a group of USSR people's deputies under the subhead "Is Initiative Punishable?" followed by I. Sichka commentary under the subhead "'Some Exceptions'"]

[Text] **Is Initiative Punishable?**

Esteemed Dmitriy Timofeyevich!

Following instructions from a subcommittee of the USSR Supreme Soviet Defense and State Security Committee, officers who are USSR people's deputies worked together with leading specialists from seven USSR Academy of Sciences institutes and representatives from three military academies and four military institutes under the USSR Defense Ministry to produce a draft concept of military reform. In written responses and at numerous meetings with voters, the draft's main ideas have received broad support from both the military and the civilian community. The draft concept of military reform is being discussed in USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions, in the Presidential Council, and also in the USSR Defense Ministry.

We appreciate that not every provision in the proposed document is shared by the military leadership. But we do feel it is quite intolerable for those who took part in this work to be victimized, encroached upon, and expelled. These methods of influence have been brought to bear upon USSR People's Deputies V.N. Lopatin and A.V. Tsalko; military scientists and specialists V.V. Serebryannikov, V.F. Kovalevskiy, Yu.I. Deryugin, A.I. Vladimirov, and S.A. Budko; others involved in work on the draft; and supporters of its basic ideas. We demand an end to both direct and indirect pressure on those involved in drafting the concept of military reform and punishment for the officials guilty of organizing this persecution.

[Signed] USSR People's Deputies V. Voskoboinikov, V. Yerokhin, A. Kazamarov, Yu. Levykin, V. Lisarenko, A. Markevich, V. Martirosyan, A. Nazarenko, V. Smirnov, and K. Kharchenko.

"Some Exceptions"

As our newspaper already reported (KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 17 May), following intervention by the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, People's Deputy Major Lopatin, one of the initiators of the draft concept of military reform, was restored to the party and a reprimand issued.

On 16 May the party commission under the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate canceled the decision to expel him from the party, and 17 May saw the last day of the conference in Lopatin's unit to elect a candidate for the 28th CPSU Congress. It was possibly a purely chance coincidence, but Lopatin's supporters ran seriously out of time. In the day remaining they were supposed to hold a meeting to put forward their candidate so that the major's nomination could then be put to the vote by the conference. But in one of the party organizations the regiment commander simply forbade them to hold the meeting in work time. In another regiment communists had it explained to them that they only had the right to nominate one candidate. And since the deputy commander of the Northern Fleet Air Arm was already standing as candidate, there could be no question of another meeting. The meeting went ahead nevertheless. The deputy commander of the air arm was recalled and Lopatin nominated in his place. He emerged the victor at the unit's party conference in the evening.

The party conference of the Northern Fleet Air Arm was held a day later. Once again, Lopatin collected the most votes of the nine candidates in a secret ballot. The fleet air arm commander came in second. The next round of votes lay ahead, the outcome of which was apparently already decided in Lopatin's favor. But then there was a hitch. First the tellers commission dragged out the count for several hours, then they decided that in view of the late hour the second round would be conducted in an open vote. A question here for first graders: How are subordinates going to vote under the stern eye of their bosses? Despite this, however, almost 60 of the 200 officers had enough courage to openly raise their hands in favor of Lopatin.

It seems that officers' wives will soon be instructed to use this name to put the fear of god into their children. A week later Maj. Lopatin was invited to Minsk by A. Smirnyy, assistant chief of the political department for the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], for a meeting with personnel. On learning about this, the political department canceled the meeting, and its initiator, A. Smirnyy, had disciplinary charges brought against him.

In conclusion: In order to avoid any ambiguity in the question of what some communists in the Army are being punished for, I will quote from LENINETS, the newspaper of the Lenin Military-Political Academy. The report from the party conference states the following: "Addressing the conference, Lieutenant General V. Grebenyuk, deputy chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy, noted communists' increased attention to all-party problems. He also noted with satisfaction that there is not a single party organization that would not support the CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress. Although there are some exceptions. Consequently, 20 people have been expelled as members of the CPSU."

Is any commentary needed? If all those who disagree are expelled, it is perfectly logical that all the rest will be as one. Only what has this got to do with "increased attention to all-party problems"?

Airborne Commander Views Military Reform

WA0506185790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 May 90 First Edition p 2

[Report on interview with Colonel General V. Achalov, commander of the airborne troops and deputy in the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondents; in Moscow, date not given: "The Army and Politics"]

[Text] Colonel General V. Achalov was interviewed by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondents at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies. He is not yet 45 years of age. He is a native of the Volga region. He was born into a peasant family. He has commanded a large guards unit of airborne troops and was chief of staff of the Leningrad Military District. In January of 1989, he was appointed commander of the airborne troops.

He has two academies behind him. Incidentally, he was in Georgiyevsliy Hall for the first time when he was graduating from the Military Academy of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces. And now he comes here as a deputy. So it is not accidental that two themes prevailed in our conversation—military and parliamentary.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Vladislav Alekseyevich, dissatisfaction with the work of the congress is growing among the deputies, but different reasons are given. And what is your position?

[Achalov] Here it is better to ask the voters. Their evaluations, apparently, are considerably harsher. For the time being, not one important question has been resolved. Even the elections of the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet, in actual fact, have become bogged down. In my opinion, the congress began spinning its wheels after the report on the socioeconomic situation of Russia was placed on the agenda before the elections of the chairman. Indeed, even the "territorial" process of discussion itself deserves severe criticism. I understand that the people are seething, and that is why they talked mainly about the troubles in their own regions. But it is time to realize: If the paramount problems are not resolved on the scale of Russia, we will not accomplish anything.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] What do you mean by this?

[Achalov] For a start, the main sore points should have been highlighted: law and order in the country, discipline, ecology, or agriculture, which has deteriorated in the extreme in our country, and any lower is a fall into an abyss. I essentially have rural voters, so this is not made up, but it is being endured by people, including by me. The congress must solve the question of the Russian village, but I already doubt that there will be a return. A lot of time and energy have been spent in vain....

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] And what can be put on the credit side?

[Achalov] Good words were spoken in defense of the Army. We note that for many republic parliaments this subject is only an excuse for discussions about "occupiers," and about the uselessness of the military. There is good reason why this has become an everyday expression: If there is no enemy, then it is necessary to create one in the image of the Army. I, for example, served for a long time on Lithuanian territory. I have only a good opinion of Lithuanians, an industrious and sympathetic people. I found a common language. But now.... Do you think that anyone of us is against the independence of the republic? But it has to be settled in another way.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Well, what now? You did not say....

[Achalov] It is necessary to talk not about the people, but about those who can quietly cut off the power supply for military facilities and refuse to settle economic questions. Who refuse medical assistance to members of servicemen's families. Of course, one can shift to autonomous, so to speak, power supplies. But is it not a war that is going on? Incidentally, it is often said of late that the paratroopers were deployed to Lithuania precisely for gendarme functions. And in actual fact? After the war our troops were formed in those localities where there were good airfields and vacant military facilities. And that is the answer.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Since you have already touched on Lithuania, what are the airborne troops now doing there?

[Achalov] Let us return to about a month or so back. The subject of airborne troops filled the Lithuanian press.

and the press frightened the people with any troop movements. But there was an end to the instruction period, and battalion and regimental exercises were held. What, are they to be canceled? Indeed, one regiment was located in Vilnius. Yes, in the event of massive disorders. Was there not a reason for this? Incidentally, the reasons were stated frankly by us in the press.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] But let us return to the congress. The Lithuanian problem was also raised here. We are interested in your assessments?

[Achalov] When the draft resolution worked up by the military deputies was read, some Moscow and Leningrad deputies left the hall. That is their affair. But do you know what I remembered? In the Baltics, 488 Muscovites and 39 Leningrad residents serve in the VDV [airborne troops], and all told there are representatives of 46 nationalities. The deputies should first talk with the mothers of the soldiers who are considered to be occupiers.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Deputies are professional politicians. In any case, part of them—those who will be elected to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. It is up to them to decide the policy of the Russian state authority. What laws do you believe have to be examined as a first priority?

[Achalov] I have already said. A concept for the development of agriculture is necessary. In my opinion, one's attitude toward the defense of the country must also be expressed. It is no secret that it is Russia that is bearing the main burden here. I would advise only not to rush to extremes. The politicians determine state policy. This is a fact. But it is impossible not to pay attention to the professionals; that is, to us, the military. But formulas for a professional army have already been debated. There has also been talk of our own Army—the Russian Army—and about territorial subunits....

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] By the way, how did you react to such statements?

[Achalov] I thought more often not about the idea itself, but about how the author arrived at it. I tried to understand the deputy. At times, I admit, I was simply astonished by the incompetence. Here is a version of the so-called Russian Army. Since we are talking about sovereignty within the scope of the Union (there were no other proposals), the implementation of such a proposal will bring about unforeseen consequences. First, a weakening of defense. And, second, unpredictability of the situation in the world. Imagine five or six and even more "nuclear buttons" in the country.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Now, apparently it is necessary to talk about a professional army and territorial subunits. Since you have analyzed all of the statements on such questions, then in what do you see the logic of these deputies?

[Achalov] Concerning territorial troops. It is difficult to see the logic here. What is the purpose of these formations? For guarding functions? Or something in the nature of local defense?

There automatically arises a comparison with the idea of national subunits that was proclaimed at one time by "Sajudis" and by the national fronts of Latvia and Estonia. Now it is clear that they tried in this way to create a skeleton of their own future armies. And another example. In Armenia the militants join the ARNA—the "Armenian National Army." The seizure of weapons and attacks on servicemen is on account of them. And the local law enforcement organs are not undertaking any measures against the militants.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] And what are the realities with respect to a professional army?

[Achalov] The army must always be professional. Otherwise, there is no point in talking about it. What we are talking about here, apparently, is the manpower acquisition procedure.

But what are the realities? The geopolitical factor must be taken into account. Statesmen and experts throughout the world never ignore it in calculations during the formulation of the defense policy of one or another state. This factor is special in our country. Unfortunately, this is overlooked by some of our supporters of an immediate, and even of a gradual, transition to a professional army.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Then you are opposed to the establishment of such an army?

[Achalov] I am for an army where everyone would execute his duty with the highest skill.

What should we do? I think, nonetheless, that it is necessary to expand manpower acquisition, let us say, with volunteers of science-intensive specialties. There are also other recommendations. Many of them are being implemented. Starting next year, an experiment will be initiated in the VDV, and we will also try to transform several subunits on a fully professional status.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] If you have no objection, then we will subsequently talk about this experiment.

[Achalov] I can only welcome this. There are many problems.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] What kind?

[Achalov] Such as, how and where people will live, for example. At times even—we conducted research—warrant officers join the VDV only to get an apartment. After resolving the apartment problem, he says goodbye to the service. Although it is not easy to get living space in our organization....

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] Interesting, but what can the Russian parliament do? In many republics, there are only refusals. Perhaps, the present congress, nevertheless, will overcome this practice. But how?

[Achalov] Protect the social guarantees of the military and of their families. Work up a mechanism for such protection on the territory of the RSFSR.

Of course, the national Supreme Soviet also has a say here. Also, the question concerning the Law on the Protection of the Honor and Dignity of the Person in Uniform can no longer be put off. This has long since been firmly fixed in many countries on a legal level. Since we ourselves do not select our destiny, but in any case execute the will of politicians, then the responsibility lies with them.

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] An unexpected turn in the conversation. With what is this associated?

[Achalov] There is nothing unexpected. Another matter, unfortunately for us, is that the people place their last hope on the Army where politicians have absolutely no control over a situation. This is a fact. If in Baku the law enforcement organs had prevented pogroms, then it would not have been necessary to initiate a state of emergency. Three paratroopers died there, all from the bullets of extremists. In peacetime. An investigation is being conducted, and the perpetrators of the pogroms and militants are being sought.

But both the press and television were silent about what then transpired in Baku. However, afterwards some newspapers very amicably called the Army gendarme.

Why then did refugees appear in the country? Is the Army to blame?

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] It is difficult to anticipate when the congress will end. But already, in all probability, it is clear to the deputies that much of what has been planned will be left for later. We have learned the main directions of your work. But will you restrict yourself only to this?

[Achalov] I admit that I like to work with young people and with teenagers. There is one idea: to expand the network of Suvorov schools and to increase the period of study. Now very many young boys are being brought up without fathers. This is a misfortune of society and a misfortune for Russia. So many such lads are scattered throughout children's homes and boarding schools.

But the idea is this. The enrollment of cadets in some military schools is dropping. Let us take advantage of this. It is not necessary to find new accommodations, and there is no need to search for new teachers.

Let the lads themselves decide whether to enroll or not to enroll in a military school afterwards. But we simply are obliged to give them a good education and upbringing.

Officers who went through Afghanistan can be brought in as officer-educators. I will find such people, and I will personally undertake this. But a special state program and resources are needed. So that again it is a matter for the politicians and legislators. I await support.

Komin on Price Reform's Impact on Armed Forces

PM0706131990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with Doctor of Economic Sciences A. Komin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices, by Candidate of Economic Sciences Colonel V. Aksenov, economic observer for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, under the rubric "Conversation on a Topical Theme"; place, date unspecified: "Price Reform: What Lies Ahead?"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Excerpts] Preparation for and implementation of price reform occupies a central place in the concept for the country's transition to a regulated market economy put to the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet by the government. Candidate of Economic Sciences Colonel V. Aksenov, our economic observer, talked to Doctor of Economic Sciences A. Komin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices, about the reasoning behind this difficult step, the nature of it, and some of the possible consequences. [passage omitted]

V. Aksenov: Radical reform will affect the entire system: wholesale, purchase, and retail prices and tariffs for services. It is thought that wholesale prices in industry could rise by as much as 46 percent. Moreover, the greatest price increases will be seen in the fuel and raw material sectors. In the fuel and energy complex, for example, the increases will reach 82 percent, while there will be a 71 percent rise in the metallurgical sector and a 64 percent rise in the chemical and timber sector.

Clearly, this cannot fail to have an impact on the prime costs of all types of industrial goods, including those in the defense complex. Defense enterprises are going to be faced with a dilemma: either a radical improvement in efficiency and cutting of production costs, or higher prices for arms and military hardware. You can imagine that, making the most of their monopoly in the defense sector, a considerable number of enterprises will choose the easier, second course of action.

Does the government program provide any obstacles to price rises in industry, including the defense industry? How, in your opinion, will it be possible in these conditions to simultaneously ensure that the country's defense capability is maintained at a sufficient level and reduce expenditure on the purchase of arms and military hardware?

A. Komin: The price increases are certainly steep and impressive. But, when it approved them, the USSR State Committee on Prices worked on the basis of the minimum increases necessary today. For example, the doubling of food prices merely aims to shed subsidies in the sale of foods as a whole.

The economy needs the new price system like air, as a guideline of what to produce and what to sell and, ultimately, of how to run things more efficiently. Today we are all tangled in the confusion over prices. When we go to the store we find that many kinds of foods are one-third of the price they were before, whereas synthetic knitwear, carpets, cars, and other goods are three times as expensive. Essentially, we are disoriented.

The new price system must ultimately put everything in its place. Naturally, the price of military hardware will increase and the correlation of various types of arms will change, which means we will have to reassess all military goods purchases and amend the military budget in connection with the price rises. [passage omitted]

V. Aksenov: As a serviceman, not everything satisfies me in the government's proposed social support system. First of all, it does not provide full retail price compensation for workers, employees, collective farm workers, and other categories of working people. It is assumed that this will act as an incentive for the able-bodied population and may be compensated by increased wages. But I have not found an answer to the question of what servicemen are supposed to do in this situation, as their income is fixed and any side employment, involvement in cooperatives, or individual labor activity is prohibited by legislation. It seems inevitable that their standard of living—which is not very high anyway—will decline even further.

The mechanism whereby dependents are compensated also apparently needs to be worked on in more detail. I am referring to servicemen's wives who are dependent. And I am thinking of all the remote garrisons and closed military camps. In these conditions, the minimum compensation of R20 does not seem socially just.

A. Komin: Compensatory measures are presented in two options, but both options work on the basis that compensation will concern everyone and that it will be the same for all citizens. I agree that the question of compensation for servicemen does have its own specific features which possibly should be taken into consideration. It is proposed to discuss various options for this purpose. Servicemen and the USSR Defense Ministry must give their opinions during this discussion.

V. Aksenov: An enormous amount of work certainly lies ahead of us. However, even now we would like the government to be more specific in defining the objectives and the mechanism of the forthcoming price reform—particularly with regard to incomplete compensation for the planned retail price increases.

*Nuclear Test Veteran Cited on 'Social Justice'

90P50022 Moscow TRUD in Russian 6 Jun 90 p 2

[Letter from Yu. Polivanov: "I Remember Nuclear September"]

[Text] In the beginning of the year TRUD published an article entitled "The Hot September of 1954" about military exercises involving the use of nuclear weapons.

Carrying out my serivce in the Belorussian Military District, I was sent, along with many other soldiers, to these exercises and was a participant in the events described by the newspaper. To this day I still experience the consequences.

Now, when so much attention is being devoted to the victims of Chernobyl, I think the time has come (unfortunately, much too late) to be concerned for those who participated in the exercises using nuclear weapons.

I would like to join with other participants in the events of September 1954 and appeal to our government for restoration of social justice regarding these people.

[Signed] Yu. Polivanov, Leningrad.

Yazov Presents Defense Ministry Prizes to Writers

PM0806151590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent: "Awards Presented"]

[Text] On 4 June Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, presented USSR Defense Ministry prizes for the best works of artistic literature on a heroic and patriotic theme to the writers O. Kirillov, I. Lazutin, N. Starikov, and A. Shchelokov. USSR Defense Ministry diplomas and officers' ceremonial daggers were presented to the writers I. Arsentyev, N. Golub, V. Maslovskiy, and V. Smirnov.

V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers' Union board; Army General K. Kochetov, first deputy defense minister; and Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, attended the honorary award presentation.

Baltic Republics

Brazauskas Cited on Aims of Moscow Visit

LD1106142890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1346 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandras Budrys]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 11 Jun (TASS)—Kazimiera Prunskiene, chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, arrived in Moscow today. She and her entourage intend to meet with Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other members of the Soviet leadership.

At the Baltic republic's permanent mission in Moscow, where the delegation is staying, the TASS correspondent was not able to meet with the head of the Lithuanian government who, it was reported, was "busy preparing for the meeting".

"The purpose of the visit is to have a discussion with the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers about a number of problems, mainly of an economic nature, which have arisen in relations between Lithuania and the Soviet Union," Algirdas Brazauskas, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, told a TASS correspondent. He noted that the program of the visit, which is expected to end later today, would be decided at these talks. [passage omitted]

Brazauskas said today that the documents which the delegation want to hand to Nikolay Ryzhkov included the decision adopted by the Lithuanian government on 30th May on "the temporary suspension of the Lithuanian government's decisions and actions stemming from the acts adopted on 11 March by the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania".

Gorbachev Decree on Amnesty Law Published

PM0906222190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

["Decree of the President of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics On the Lithuanian SSR Law 'On an Amnesty in Connection With the Restoration of an Independent Lithuanian State'"]

[Text] The Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet adopted 8 May 1990 a Law "On an Amnesty in Connection With the Restoration of an Independent Lithuanian State."

According to Article 8 of the aforementioned law, the amnesty extends to all persons who committed crimes on the republic's territory prior to 11 March 1990. The said norm is in contravention of point 14, Article 77 of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution, which gives it authority to declare an amnesty solely in respect of citizens convicted by the republic's courts.

Taking cognizance of the fact that the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet act affects citizens' rights, and on the basis of point 1, article 127/8 of the USSR Constitution, I resolve:

1. That the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs take the requisite steps to preclude execution of the Lithuanian SSR Law of 8 May 1990 "On an Amnesty in Connection With the Restoration of the Lithuanian State" [title as published] in respect of USSR citizens convicted by USSR and other union republic courts.

2. To proceed from the premise that the USSR prosecutor general will ensure supervision of the execution of the Lithuanian SSR Law of 8 May 1990 "On an Amnesty in Connection with the Restoration of the Lithuanian State" in strict accordance with the requirements of the USSR Constitution and the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR.

[Signed] President of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics M. Gorbachev.
Moscow, the Kremlin, 8 June 1990

More on Decree

LD0806174590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1542 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 8 Jun (TASS)—A decree of the USSR president on the law "on the amnesty in connection with the restoration of an independent Lithuanian SSR" on 8 May, was distributed here today.

The decree notes that this norm contradicts Point 14 of Article 77 of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution which places within its jurisdiction the declaration of an amnesty only with regard to citizens sentenced by the republic's courts, whereas under Article 8 of the said law, the amnesty is extended to all those who had committed crimes on the territory of the republic before 11 March, 1990.

The president of the USSR has decreed that the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs take necessary measures to prevent execution of the Lithuanian SSR law (?of this year) "On the amnesty in connection with the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state" with regard to citizens of the USSR who were sentenced by the USSR and other union republics.

The USSR general prosecutor is required to ensure supervision of the implementation of this law in strict accordance with the requirements of the USSR Constitution and the Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR.

Lithuanian Official on Decree

LD0906123490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1005 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Algirds Usas at the microphone. Yesterday, many people were anxious on being informed about the decree by USSR President Gorbachev. It concerned the amnesty law adopted by the Supreme Council after the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state. There are two points in that order and it was not clear to me whether attempts were being made to stop or to proclaim this law invalid. Thus, this morning I phoned lawyers in order to establish the meaning of this order. It is of special importance to the Administration of Penitentiary at the Ministry of Internal Affairs which is coping with these matters. Here is an interview with the head of this administration, Ervidas Stepulevicius:

[Begin recording] [Stepulevicius] I have examined the decree of the Soviet Union's president which was signed yesterday and it seems to me that it applies also to persons who have been sentenced by courts in other republics, as well as by military tribunals [passage omitted] There are people in our republic who have been sentenced by military tribunals and are serving their sentences.

[Usas] Thus, the amnesty announced by the Supreme Council will remain in force, this order essentially does not contradict it, and the amnesty will be applied?

[Stepulevicius] As far as I understand, after having studied this order by the president, the amnesty will be applied. We will continue to apply amnesty to the citizens of our republic. As I mentioned, as of today we have released 60 people and reduced sentences for several people.

[Usas] Thus, after a long time we have received a message from President Gorbachev which, it seems, will not influence the consolidation of our independence. [end recording]

Lithuanian Economic, Energy Situation Updated

LD0906090190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] A Lithuanian government communique on the economic situation in the republic: During the last two days the power supply situation has changed in the republic. When the Ignalina nuclear power station suddenly ceased operating, the Lithuanian state regional power station started using 2.5 million cubic meters of natural gas from the Soviet Union per day. This quantity is insufficient, therefore, the power station has to use the last remnants of fuel oil. In the last two days limitations on the use of power were introduced for industrial enterprises. All consumers adhere to the discpline in the use of power.

The reason for the stoppage at the Ignalina power station has been clarified. The second set was stopped automatically when the safety system incorrectly switched itself on.

At today's meeting of the government commission for regulating the economic situation, the Ministry of trade stated that in five months of this year the Republic's industrial enterprises turned out products basically in accordance with the envisaged market funds. This has been achieved through a reduction of discontinuation of supplies to the Soviet Union.

The economic blockade has reached a stage when not only future trade relations, but also our future economic structure are becoming clearer. The preparation of the government economic program for next year is coming to the agenda. The ministries and departments were instructed to submit [word indistinct] of their functioning in 1991. On this basis the government will propose a general program for Lithuania's national economic next year.

More on Energy Supply

LD0706120690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0850 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Report by Valdas Kanapienis]

[Text] I have just returned from a session of the Antiblockade Commission at the Council of Ministers. Prime Minister K. Prunskiene and both deputy prime ministers, Algirdas Brazauskas and Romualdas Ozolas, took part in the session. Power engineering, as on every day, was the first item on the agenda. Algirdas Brazauskas said that Ryabev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, had indicated that it had been decided to supply 3.5 million cubic meters of gas to Lithuania every 24 hours, which would enable us to generate 60 megawatts of electric power. This is good news.

The Ignalina Nuclear Electric Power Station started operating normally and probably at this very moment is operating at normal capacity. The situation at rayon boiler houses is better; there will be enough fuel for at least 20 days.

There is a possibility of exchanging our commodities for gasoline and diesel fuel in the Soviet Union. This fuel could be brought in by trucks; however, vehicles from Lithuania are stopped in neighboring Belorussia and fuel is often confiscated. Therefore, so far there are no guarantees.

Following this, K. Prunskiene, chairman of the Council of Ministers, talked about the meeting of the three prime ministers from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia during the Baltic Assembly which took place in Latvia. It has been decided to share resources and help each other. A wide spectrum of issues was discussed. For example, Estonians proposed employing Lithuania's unemployed. Perhaps the most important point is that the prime ministers of Latvia and Estonia are prepared to help Lithuania as much as possible.

Locomotives Begin Withdrawal From Lithuania

LD0806223290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2150 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Claiming that they are not Lithuania's property the Soviet Union has started taking away locomotives held by Lithuania. The explanation lies in the fact that the Lithuanian Ministry of Transport has begun using locomotives as a source of thermal power to enable the functioning of vital enterprises by dairies and meat processing plants. Now the Transport Ministry has to find a way of settling the problem.

Lithuanian Nuclear Generators Activated

LD1006141590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Jonas Valiukonis, senior operator at the Lithuanian Amalgamation Energetika Control Service, states that yesterday afternoon the third turbo-generator at the Ignalina nuclear electric power station was put into operation. This morning the fourth turbo-generator of the same power unit was also put into operation.

At present the Ignalina nuclear electric power station is operating at a capacity of 1,000 magawatts. It is believed that by this afternoon the normal capacity will be reached.

The Lithuanian state regional electric power station is working under normal working conditions.

Lithuania Denies 'Allegedly Softened' Blockade

LD0906224790 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] The Lithuanian government's information service has asked Radio Vilnius to broadcast the following refutation:

On 8 June the radio stations Free Europe and Deutsche Welle reported in their Lithuanian and Russian language broadcasts that the Soviet Union had allegedly softened the blockade against Lithuania by increasing the supplies of oil and gas. The Lithuanian government's Information Service is authorized to communicate that Lithuania has not been receiving oil and oil products since the start of the blockade. Yesterday the Elektrenai thermal power station did receive two and a half million cubic meters of natural gas. This, however, was but a temporary increase in connection with the threat to the northwestern power network of the Soviet Union, caused by the sudden stop of the Ignalina nuclear power plant.

Vessels Barred From Fishing in 'Foreign Sounds'

LD0806224890 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 8 Jun

[Text] The Lithuanian sea fishing fleet has also felt the effects of the blockade as it officially remains under Soviet subordination. Lithuanian vessels were pressed to leave the areas abounding in fish on the grounds that Lithuania had no currency to pay for fishing in foreign sounds. The Soviet authorities forget, however, that all foreign currency earned by Lithuanians goes to Moscow.

Brazauskas Interviewed on TV Appearance

LD0806174290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Independent Lithuanian Communist Party, by Benas Rupeika; place, date not specified—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Rupeika] How do you think, why are there no longer Friday interviews with you on the Lithuanian radio?

[Brazauskas] I think that you can give a better reply to this question than I can. How can I answer this question? First of all, I am very busy, there is a lot to do. I do not seek it, maybe I could find Benas Rupeika if I wanted to.

[Rupeika] I want to remind you that this evening you and three other of your colleagues will be on television.

[Brazauskas] Indeed, my colleagues secretaries Vladimiras Beriozovas, Justas Paleckis, and member of our bureau, Eduardas Vilkas. We have decided that it will not be bad if we again, the same persons, take part in the broadcast. [passage omitted]

[Rupeika] I think there will be questions and, you, as now, will give direct replies.

[Brazauskas] Of course. I do not doubt that there will be questions, furthermore, as many changes have taken place in our life during this period of time, in relations, in the mood of the people, and in the state of affairs.

[Rupeika] Algirdas Brazauskas. If somebody has forgotten, he is vice-premier and the first secretary of the central committee of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party.

Lithuanian Council Views Social, Economic Issues

LD1006112490 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Two sittings were held today at Lithuania's Council of Ministers. The first consultative sitting of the government was devoted to problems of social maintenance, culture and education, as well as economic ties with foreign countries. Respective ministers presented their programs on these issues which will serve as a basis when drafting the guidelines of the government's economic reform program. In the opinion of the minister of social maintenance, issues of labor and payments must be regulated, taking into consideration the labor market. The real incomes of the population can be stabilized by constantly monitoring the subsistence wage and the payments to the population, as well as through a gradual abolishment of tax payment. The educational conception proposes a demilitarization and depolitization of the schools.

The afternoon sitting of the Lithuanian Government envisaged measures on fulfilling the economic cooperation agreement between Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

A resolution was also adopted on drafting state agreements with the Soviet Union. A coordinating commission headed by Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene had been set up for talks with the Soviet Union and the union republics.

Economist Urges Suspension of Declaration, Talks

LD0906162490 Moscow TASS in English 1506 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscilla]

[Text] Vilnius June 9 TASS—"We are prepared to travel to Moscow, develop contacts to bring closer the beginning of the dialogue but for this we need relevant authority and a certain basis," Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party declared on behalf of his party. On Friday night, he and other party leaders appeared in the dialogues programme of Lithuanian television.

Academician Eduardas Vilkas, a prominent economist and a member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee reiterated that the independent Communist Party would continue to work for Lithuania's independence.

At the same time he called on the Lithuanian parliament to "make a decision, which is acceptable also to the Soviet Union and can bring us closer to negotiations".

Vilkas made it clear that a practical way out of the present blind alley would be to suspend the act of the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state and to begin talks with the Soviet Union.

"Each day of the blockade spells our defeat, not our victory," he said. "The more we procrastinate, the more we distance ourselves from independence".

"Our obstinacy is pointless," he said.

Lizichev Interviewed on Lithuanian Issues

LD0806211390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1756 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Interview with Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the USSR Army and Navy, by unidentified reporter; in Vilnius; date not given; live or recorded—from the "Topical Interview" program]

[Text] [Reporter] Aleksey Dmitriyevich, what circumstances led to your trip to the Baltic Military District and the republics of the Soviet Baltic?

[Lizichev] No doubt, there were two reasons. First of all, the fact that this region has attracted particular attention for the whole country and our whole society, and the Army is part of the people and that society, in connection with the situation that has developed in those republics. That's the first thing. Second, the fact that we are receiving a great many letters at the moment from servicemen and the members of the families, from veterans and troops in the reserve, which raise three questions and do so as a matter of great urgency. The first regards rescinding the illegal acts and laws which have been adopted by the local leadership and which contradict both the country's Constitution and Soviet all-Union legislation, and which contradict decrees of the president of our country. If we take this with regard to servicemen, to my knowledge at present, nine illegal acts have been passed in Lithuania, seven in Latvia, and five in Estonia, and even now they are already having a serious impact on compliance with the Law on Universal Military Service.

The second trend about which people are not only expressing concern, but over which they are also making demands, is that various political actions being organized by destructive, separatist, and nationalist forces against the Army, against officers, soldiers, and sergeants, should be eliminated. Many different kinds of organized ventures are held in order to compromise the Army. They pin on labels: Occupiers! Not only are they not ashamed to speak of this, they picket check- and crossing-points, troops units and military commissariats. That's not to mention the local press, which is, to be blunt, not modest in its expressions and does not balk at slander and lies regarding servicemen, their assignments, etc. One thing is surprising: If the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians living in other areas of our country and serving in our troop units were treated like this—I have come across instances here when rumors are disseminated or there are write-ups of their allegedly being oppressed by people in our troop units—I can say with all responsibility that there is no such oppression in the Armed Forces regarding individuals of any nationality, and all the more so, regarding Latvians, Lithuanians, and Estonians. I should like to give this assurance to parents and comrades, that there is no such thing. We inculcate respect for all nationalities and there is no oppression and no insults aimed at servicemen from these republics. Please do not worry about this. It is a lie which, I think, is being deliberately spread in order to compromise the Army and its procedures once again.

Third are instances of moral and occasionally physical terror against servicemen and the members of their families, even against the children of servicemen. This can be seen in the fact that people are beaten up, insulted and threatened. There's no shortage of facts. And one thing is surprising: Those who talk about political culture, human rights, and observing these, not only ignore them once they have come to power, not only adopt such illegal acts, but also set people against one another, the locals against the Russian-speaking population. I should like to say just one thing: that we have never placed the leaders of these republics and their populations on the same level. I can say that within the Armed Forces, Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians are serving well.

During my service, I have met a lot with officers and soldiers and sergeants. Now I am definitely trying to meet with lads who have been called up from these republics among the troops. And I must say that these lads are serving exceedingly conscientiously and well, and it is only what is prompting them to illegal acts that is letting down these lads. (?Whoever obeys it) sooner or later one has to answer according to the law. Service is service. The law is the law. It must be observed. Naturally, we will not remain indifferent to those who violate laws. This is natural, despite all the tolerance which has been demonstrated and will continue to be demonstrated. But the law is the law. The law must be observed, and we will put it into effect.

[Reporter] You have had many meetings with servicemen of the Baltic Military District. Tell me please, what did you say and to what did you appeal in this complex situation?

[Lizichev] The only demand is to demonstrate prudence, to demonstrate tolerance, to be able to hear and listen to people and to find ways of jointly resolving this or that issue. For us servicemen, all Soviet people are under protection. We protect all Soviet people, and the whole population of the republics. And we are surprised at such an attitude to protectors. We are defending everyone, I repeat once more. The whole population. And we are called to do this.

[Reporter] The situation is extremely complex in the Baltic republics, among other things, concerning the conscription of youth to national service.

[Lizichev] Conscription is a serious stage in the life of the troops and the life of our population and youth. The call-up determines the degree of combat readiness, the degree of military and patriotic education of people and their readiness to join the ranks of the Armed Forces and fulfil their martial duty. In the present case, I would like to say that this year the progress of conscription is significantly more complex than in previous years. Only about 20 percent today have been conscripted from those youths in Lithuania that we must conscript, and less than 10 percent from Latvia and Estonia.

It is clear that, if I were asked what assessment I would give, I would say that so far conscription is going unsatisfactorily. The reasons for this lie in those acts which have been adopted, which contradict Union legislation. This is the first thing.

Second, that propaganda which is being carried out among youth. Third, those structures of authority locally and in the center, that is, in the republics, which have been set up to encourage lads' evasion of conscription to the Armed Forces. And that propaganda which is being carried out. There are even threats as well—well, in any case, the aspiration to compromise such people, accuse them of lack of patriotism and accuse the parents of lack of patriotism. This may lead to the situation that we will not man a part of a ship, a formation, or a crew on military alert duty [ekipazha boyevogo dezhurstva]. This means that the combat readiness of our troops will be reduced, which is fraught [with problems] for the country's defense capacity.

But the main thing is that the young person is being put under such conditions where we are forced to apply the law. And application of the law demands criminal liability, with all its consequences. Young people should know this. Parents should also know this. You cannot escape from this. The law must be observed.

Visas Denied for Vilnius Human Rights Conference

LD0606220390 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] A big international human rights conference was scheduled to take place in Vilnius this autumn. Unfortunately it has turned out that it cannot be held as most foreign guests have been refused entrance visas by the Soviet authorities. Lithuanian representatives have called on Leningrad, asking it to host the Vilnius '90 Human Rights Conference.

Further on Split of Estonian Communist Party

PM0806182590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Dispatch by L. Levitskiy: "Estonia: Two Communist Parties Clarify Relations"]

[Text] Tallinn—The Sixth Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia, which has preserved its unity with the CPSU, has decided to resume the proceedings of the 20th Communist Party Congress 21 June.

Let me recall that the Communist Party of Estonia split at the 20th Congress in March. A large section of delegates elected a coalition Central Committee and deemed the congress proceedings closed. However, a substantial group of communists representing, in the main, major enterprise collectives disagreed. They elected their own Central Committee and decided to resume the congress proceedings at a later date.

The sixth plenum, to which members of the coalition Central Committee who have not joined the autonomous Communist Party of Estonia were also invited, did not pass without arguments. Some participants expressed the view that the resumption of the congress before the forum of the country's communists has taken place will only exacerbate the split in the republic. But the majority insisted that it is high time for positions to be clearly defined inasmuch as it is impossible for people to remain members of two different parties.

An especially heated debate took place on how mutual relations should be built with members of the coalition Central Committee who have not joined the autonomous Communist Party of Estonia but have not switched to the Communist Party on the CPSU platform either. In the opinion of the majority, the compromise—oining the coalition Central Committee—has not produced anything. Contrary to expectations, it did not help o retain Estonian communists in the party. In rural ayons, it was said, "party cards are being handed in by the sackful." Hopes that access to the mass media would be obtained have not been vindicated either. The "official" Communist Party of Estonia has, essentially, been deprived of its own press. Communists who do not share the Estonocentrist ideas have no opportunity to expound their views. Party property is being distributed apace. And what is more, everything is being decided by leaders of the autonomous Communist Party without their even notifying the others.

The following figures were cited: The autonomous Communist Party of Estonia, or Estonian Communist Party as it is increasingly being referred to, has a membership of some 3,000. The CPSU has 32,000 members in Tallinn alone. Therefore the plenum participants demanded equal conditions for the work of all party committees. The debate ended with the adoption of the following resolution: "To issue an appeal to primary organizations whose communists have been elected to the Central Committee of the autonomous Communist Party of Estonia, and to the communists themselves, asking them to take the decision to withdraw from the said Central Committee."

....A session of the bureau of the autonomous Communist Party of Estonia has been held. It discussed the situation in the party. "Attempts of the alternative Communist Party to dislodge the autonomous Communist Party of Estonia from the political arena" were denounced. The bureau discussed the letter of four first secretaries of district party committees which was published in the newspaper RAHVA HAAL. It is entitled "Reply to Politburo." The letter sharply denounced the CPSU Central Committee document on the situation in the Communist Party of Estonia following its 20th congress. Much has been written about this document in the republic press of late, but the document itself has not been published anywhere. The Central Committee Bureau essentially backed the assessment of the document expressed by the authors of the letter.

According to the common opinion which rang out both at the plenum and the bureau session, while the Communist Parties are clarifying relations between each other, Estonia is increasingly veering to the right.

Rubiks Interviewed on Goals of Party

LD0906211090 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Interview with A.P. Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, by correspondent Kasyanova, in Riga on 9 June—recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Kasyanova] Alfred Petrovich, you call yourself a member of the Communist Party. What do you see as your organization's goals today and tomorrow?

[Rubiks] I see the goal of our party as bringing the whole people to that democratic socialism along that path of socialist choice which we have defined for our party. This must be a society where all human rights are defended, in the first place, because today, often when discussing a democratic society, nevertheless the authors of these arguments see either the priority of their nation or of one single people or of one territory over another. It is necessary to work against this. [video shows Rubiks being interviewed in foyer of congress hall]

Rubiks Addresses Latvian Party Congress

LD0906200990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] The second stage of the 25th Congress of the Latvian Communist Party is taking place in Riga. Our correspondent Ninel Meshkun reports:

[Meshkun] As is known, after the split which took place at the April congress and the withdrawal of a minority to form an independent Latvian Communist Party, the majority who continue to stand on the platform of the CPSU have elected a new party leadership and decided to switch the congress sessions.

Today 438 delegates represented at their forum 166,307 communists. At the beginning of this year there were 176,000 members of the republic's communist party. As Alfred Petrovich Rubiks, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, appraised the situation in his report on the tactics of the Latvian Communist Party at the present stage, it is possible that yet more will leave, but then there will remain genuine fighters, that dozen which is capable of convincing hundreds. The leader of the Latvian communists analyzed the political situation in the republic, the conditions and the action progam in conditions of multipartyism.

Alfred Petrovich Rubiks formulated the position of the Latvian Communist Party. Today's political mix often includes ethnic and nationalistic concepts. We take the responsibility, he said, for the party's past mistakes in ethnic policy, and we are using all our strength to overcome them. We support the natural aspirations of Latvians to maintain their uniqueness, language, traditions, structure, and historical memory. But we consider that the satisfying of the interests of any nation cannot be acquainted at the expense of harming the interests of other nationalities. Nothing ever brought a people to greater misfortunes than its attempts to achieve supremacy over other peoples.

Today 35,000 people are in favor of holding a referendum in Latvia on the issue of the republic's state independence. Is it possible to ignore their destiny? The Latvian Communist Party defends and propagates the socialist choice of development for the Latvian state. We base it on values common to mankind. The society toward which we strive must be a society of justice and humanism. This is the point of view of Latvian communists.

The particpants in the congress discussed the draft rules and platform of the CPSU and elected delegates to the

28th party congress. It has been decided that the 25th Latvian Communist Party congress will finish its work after the 28th Congress of the CPSU.

Godmanis Views Independence, Internal Tensions

PM0706132490 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 22, 10-17 Jun 90 p 7

[Interview with Latvian Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis by Viktor Kyucharyants, place, date not given: "Ivars Godmanis: Not All Decisions Are Made in Moscow"—first three paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] Can one live in two Latvias? Yes, for a time one can manage. But it's getting more and more difficult. The unreal reality of two constitutions acting simultaneously: the Constitution of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Constitution of the Latvian Republic. Dual power and one people, speaking different languages but until recently understanding one another quite well. Now they increasingly talk the common language of intolerance. A dialogue of the deaf. The increasing polarization of opinions, bordering on confrontation and hostility. The protection of the Supreme Soviet from huge crowds by the armed internal troops. The recruitment of voluntary "self-defence" squads, as of last Sunday... Will the Bible with its "every kingdom divided against itself goes to ruin" prove right once again?

What happens tomorrow?

"The only thing one can say with confidence is that we shall not rescind the Declaration of Independence," Ivars Godmanis, Chairman of the Latvian cabinet, told MN.

[Kyuchuryants] Mr. Godmanis, what is it like to be Prime Minister when almost half the people do not recognize either the Declaration or your government? What is most trying for you?

[Godmanis] To keep convincing people that our programme and the laws adopted by our parliament are in the interests of the whole people, including critics of our course towards independence. For me personally the greatest problem is to keep my opponents at bay, but they are closing in one me.

[Kyuchuryants] Do you mean to say that the controversy between the Latvian and non-Latvian population is growing tenser?

[Godmanis] Yes, in a measure. This is sad, because it is thoroughly out of character for our multinational Republic. Although we never accepted and never will accept the so-called entry into the USSR, all of us living in Latvia—Latvians, Russians, Jews, Poles—have lived side by side for half a century without any national conflicts. We shared our joys and our misfortunes: the totalitarian system and the absurd economy which has brought us to poverty and ecological disaster. Now that Latvia, emulating its neighbours, has decided to untie the long-standing knot, the habital fear of change has surfaced in some people, especially the Russians who are being provoked with the idea of being second-rate citizens in Latvia.

[Kyuchuryants] Who's provoking them?

[Godmanis] The Latvian Communist party. And the military.

[Kyuchuryants] Yet the conflict is not purely ethnic. Rather it is a clash of opinions about statehood. Some regard Latvia as a state. Others (more than a third of the population in fact) will concede only statehood of the USSR, in which Latvia must take its usual place. How can this situation be resolved?

[Godmanis] There's only one solution—not only for us, but for all the Union Republics seeking sovereignty: decentralization of the Union. A real, not ostentatious decentralization. A new treaty of alliance and intergovernmental agreements, taking into account each party's sovereignty. No matter how much said about renovated federation, the existing USSR Constitution declares that the Soviet Union is a state, not a union of states. The new law on the secession of Republics from the USSR, which provides for neither the principle of consensus nor the right to veto, is nothing but a trick complicating the process.

[Kyuchuryants] Could we return to the question of duality of power?

[Godmanis] Then we must clearly define who is the second power. As if to counterbalance the Supreme Soviet and the government of Latvia, a Committee for the Protection of the Constitution and the rights of USSR Citizens has just been set up. It lays claim to power and consists largely of the representatives of the armed forces and the law-enforcement bodies.

[Kyuchuryants] Alfreds Rubiks, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party, says that the workers and the military have been brought together by their common concern about the future of Soviet power in Latvia...

[Godmanis] I am afraid, it is not so much the Soviet power as the power of the Communist Party itself that is at stake, since the Communist Party lost the first really democratic election to the Popular Front. My impression is that neither Rubiks, nor other leaders of the Communist Party are worried about what might happen if everything comes full circle.

[Kyuchuryants] How can this happen? I don't feel the present Supreme Soviet is going to resign. Do you mean a military coup?

[Godmanis] I just bear this possibility in mind.

[Kyuchuryants] What then?

[Godmanis] That would be a catastrophe for our small nation and it would close the door to independence. I'm speaking as a person who knows the deep-down feelings and the thinking of my people. If a reversal occurs, the people will most probably fall into lethargy, into a deep, incapacitating apathy. The other option is a mass exodus.

[Kyuchuryants] In this connection, what is your top priority as head of the government?

[Godmanis] To prevent further deterioration of the situation, to ensure a normal life and peace for all citizens.

[Kyuchuryants] You are talking about peace and dialogue. In this connection, let's go back to the important and highly sensitive issue of citizenship. What is to be done when the press quotes a prominent Popular Front leader as saying: "We cannot promise the remaining 50 per cent that we'll grant them Latvian citizenship if they ask for it. Let's not be hypocritical: people who are afraid are half vanquished. The huge mass of settlers has no right to receive Latvian citizenship." There are other statements, according to which a certain category of people should be put on probation before being granted citizenship.

[Godmanis] I oppose such ideas. If Latvia is a sovereign state, all people permanently residing here must be granted citizenship, if they so wish, without any conditions.

[Kyuchuryants] A certain MP called the independence act of May 4, "independence for breakfast". Your political opponent, leader of the parliamentary minority faction Sergejs Dimanis, is convinced that the government has no clear-cut economic programme for this difficult transition period...

[Godmanis] We have got ten concrete economic projects, among them draft laws on land reform on the banking system, on enterprise, on prices, etc. We shall introduce market relations inside the republic and in the Baltic region. Then we shall begin organizing economic cooperation, by way of intergovernmental agremeents, with other regions of the USSR. The opposition regards this as a Utopia. And we believe it extremely dangerous to institute a market economy overnight all over the country, given that various regions differ so markedly in their level of economic development, democracy, culture, etc. Such a step could lead to further polarization and new problems.

[Kyuchuryants] You declared your independence just over three weeks ago. Lithuania's experience is longer. Are you learning from its experience and mistakes?

[Godmanis] What is its "mistake"? The fact that the tiny Lithuania has shown such great daring?... Of course, the practical steps following the declaration of independence ought to be based on realistic premises. In our declaration the necessity for dialogue with Moscow is provided for, and I for once sincerely hope the dialogue will be realistic. Indeed, you cannot demand that the Supreme Soviet of Latvia repeal a declaration which it adopted. In any case, this is not going to happen in Latvia. Not all decisions are made in Moscow.

Latvia Sees Signature Collection as 'Provocation'

LD1006150190 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Difficult as it may be, all the three Baltic republics are every day advancing step by step along the road they have chosen. Instructions from the center continue. In Latvia, Russian-speaking residents are collecting signatures in favor of a referendum, which is demanded by the Soviet president. And although these signatures top hundreds of thousands, as Moscow TV maintains, the Latvians take this action as another provocation. It's of interest that the new chairman of Russia's Supreme Soviet, Boris Yeltsin, intends to call all Russians to return to their homeland. There will hardly be many willing to return from the Baltic republics. To raise a clamor and to carry out a provocation is one thing, while to go back to a lower standard of living is quite another. One more problem is that Russians in the Baltic republics are more conservative than their countrymen in the Russian Federation, where democratic forces are very active already.

Latvian Party, Media Exchange Accusations

LD0806154190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0900 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Before we tell you other news, we would ask you to listen to the text sent to the management of our radio and television by the Latvian Communist Party, that is, the CPSU territorial organization in Latvia. The letter is dated 5 June of this year. I quote: We request a provision to relay on television and radio the proceedings of the 25th Congress of the Latvian Communist Party for a two-hour period. The congress will take place on 9 June of this year in the Political Education House of the Latvian Communist Party. Work will commence at 1000. We guarantee payment in accordance with your account; the number of the appropriate account is given. End of quote.

The letter is signed by the secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, Ojars Potreki. We underline the main request: to relay the congress for a two-hour period. Such is the letter we received. But, what does the press center of this congress write in today's SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA? Perhaps you have already read it. If not, we will inform you briefly. The press center is accusing radio and television management of only allotting two hours for reflecting such a significant event. This is said to be the decision of the radio & television management, following the logic that what is not interesting to us cannot interest the inhabitants of the republic either. What does this mean? Perhaps, that in different sections of this organiztion there is not any informativeness or the most elementary order. The conjectures could continue. It seems to us that these are downright lies; what if somebody believe them? A stereotype: What can you do? But, there should also be responsibility for lies, or at least one should apologize. Just one little addition: Our conjectures that in this organization the right hands does not know what the left hand is doing were confirmed. Further proof of this is also the fact that Secretary Ojars Potreki a moment ago made a telephone call to the [radio and television] committee leaders, in which the secretary apologized for the lies from the press center and promised to seek out the guilty ones.

Latvian Republic Ministers Appointed

905P0023

[Editorial Report] Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian for 17, 19, and 22 May 1990 on pages 1, 1, and 3, respectively, published decrees of the Latvian Republic Supreme Soviet appointing the following to government posts:

11 May decrees:

Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Latvian Republic—**Arnis Kalnins**;

Minister of Economics of the Latvian Republic—**Janis Aboltins**.

14 May decree:

Minister of Finance of the Latvian Republic—**Elmars Silins**.

15 May decrees:

Minister of Trade of the Latvian Republic—**Armands Plaudis**;

Minister of Material Resources of the Latvian Republic—**Edgars Zausajevs**;

Minister of Energy of the Latvian Repulbic—**Auseklis Lazdins**;

Minister of Communications of the Latvian Republic—**Janis Janovskis**.

16 May decrees:

Minister for Governmental Affairs of the Latvian Republic—**Karlis Licis**;

Chief State Arbitrator of the Latvian Republic (with instructions to present a proposal to the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian Republic on the staff of the Collegium of the Latvian Republic State Arbitrator)—**Gvido Narkevics**;

Minister of Culture of the Latvian Republic—**Raimonds Pauls**;

Minister of Health of the Latvian Republic—**Edvins Platkajis**;

Minister of Architecture and Construction of the Latvian Republic—**Aivars Prusis**;

Chairman of the Supreme Court of the Latvian Republic (with instructions to present a proposal to the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian Republic on the staff of the Latvian Republic Supreme Court and its Presidium)—**Gvido Zemribo**.

18 May decree:

Minister of Social Security of the Latvian Republic—**Uldis Gundars**.

Baltic Leaders Discuss Results of Talks

LD0806173590 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1545 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Press conference with Lithuania President Vytautas Landsbergis, Latvian Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatolily Gorbunov, and Estonian Supreme Soviet Chairman Arnold Ryuytel, in Riga on 6 June—questions and answers in Russian]

[Excerpts] [Unidentified female announcer in Latvian] Good evening. May I present the participants in this press conference, Mr. Vytautas Landsbergis, president of the republic of Lithuania; Mr. Anatolily Gorbunov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Estonia. Our press conference will last one hour. Questions are invited. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent Mikhail Bondin, Russian Service of Radio Liberty] I have two questions. The first one is to any of you: During today's session [of the Baltic Council] was there a discussion of the possibility of contacts and cooperation with the new government of the Russian Federation? Thank You.

[Ruutel] We adopted an address at the Supreme Soviet of Estonia to the Congress of the Russian Federation and also congratulated Yeltsin, and I have also done this personally in my telegram. In this statement we proposed continuing the economic and cultural ties with the Russian Federation, and, of course, to expand those ties. There are hopes that this will be of mutual interest.

[Bondin] Thank you, and my second question is to Mr. Landsbergis. Mr. Landsbergis, if the economic blockade on Lithuania continues, will you make any concessions? What I have in mind, the main thing, of course, is the independence declaration. Thank you.

[Landsbergis] If the economic blockade continues, it will bring many privations and sufferings to the entire population of Lithuania, and in as much as its aim is to cause great unemployment and social disorder and destabilization of the situation in Lithuania, no one can guarantee that this will never be, that the Soviet Union will never succeed in destabilizing the situation in this part of the Baltic region. But if that happens, then there is no legal mechanism to suspend the declaration of independence. This simply cannot be done either by the present

Supreme Council, which does not have a mandate for that, nor—even more so—would such a step be authorized in circumstances of violence, as a forced step and not as a free phenomenon. So this demand essentally is not rational, to put it mildly. [passage omitted]

[Ryuytel] We need to help each other. And on behalf of Estonia, I can state that we have already examined several times these questions on how to help Lithuania in the economic sense and in the social sense, and we are still continuing work in that direction to find possibilities of feeling [as heard] help both materially and spiritually for each other. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent] I have a simple question. What were the main and most urgent questions of your meeting today, and what results were achieved. How do you rate them?

[Landsbergis] First of all this was the first time we had met as the Baltic Council of State which was instituted by decisions and the declaration of 12 May signed in Tallinn, and by subsequent decisions of our Supreme Soviets and Presidiums of Supreme Soviets. And so one of the documents was a certain self-definition, a document about the activity of the Baltic Council of State, with elements of regulations of how we shall function, what forms of work etc. We signed that. We also wrote, edited, and signed a telegram which will probably be handed over in the form of a letter to Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the Soviet Union. We also prepared an appeal to the parliaments and governments of the world. We sent a congratulations telegram on the occasion of this day to the Swedish king and people. Another document or two were not fully completed. We hope to conclude them this evening.

[Gorbunov] I don't need to list what we did today, what we signed and what we shall be signing. For me the main thing today—I join in what Mr. Landsbergis was saying—but for me the main thing was that we to some extent started talking and now the talking is still continuing. This talking is being continued by the chairmen of the Councils of Ministers, Mrs. Prunskiene, Mr. Godmanis, and Mr Savisaar. [passage omitted]

[Otto Frank, CTK correspondent] Can you tell us in more detail about what was in the telegram to Mr. Gorbachev, and what do you intend to do to finally start a dialogue, a joint dialogue, with Moscow?

[Ryuytel] I have to say—I don't even know how many times I have spoken to Mikhail Gorbachev about this year—that we must sit down, indeed at a round table to discuss all issues whether they concern Estonia, Latvia, or Lithuania, and I have proposed that this be done jointly, precisely because, as I already said earlier, there are only Baltic issues—not just Lithuania, Estonian or Latvian issues. But I have to say that of course we have understood each other in many of these talks, and I think that indeed this will happen quickly. But you know that in politics not everything always happens as one would like, and it has come about that so far we have not sat down at that table, although we have met many times, and this telegram of ours is aimed at expressing once again our will and aspiration really to discuss this question very seriously, and we shall wait for an answer and we shall see what happens. [passage omitted]

Baltic Foreign Ministers Visit Norway

LD1106135490 Moscow TASS in English 1349 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Oslo June 11 TASS—Foreign ministers of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia made a brief visit to the Norwegian capital. They were received by Norwegian Foreign Minister Kjell Bondevik. The political situation in the Baltic republics and the possibility of economic aid from Norway was discussed.

Baltic representatives noted the heightening of political tension in the republics and the continued exacerbation of relations between the republican authorities and the federal government. The complex political situation is aggravated by increasing economic difficulties. A particularly tense situation developed in Lithuania, where an acute shortage of oil paralyses the economy.

During the negotiations the guests expressed interest in receiving aid from Norway, which is a major exporter of oil. The Norwegian side stated its moral support for the present course of the Baltic republics but refrained from specific promises of such aid. At the same time it was repeated that Norwegian companies could sell oil for hard currency at world market prices.

The Norwegian foreign minister called for a peaceful solution to the question of Baltic independence. This problem must be resolved at the negotiating table, he said.

More Reporting on Baltic Council Meeting

PM1106095790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by Colonel M. Ziveminsh: "Baltic Council Meeting"]

[Text] Riga—On 6 June the leaders of the three Baltic republics came to the resort city of Jurmala for a meeting within the framework of the Baltic Council. This was the second meeting at such a high level within a month. The first meeting, as the press reported, took place in Tallinn 12 May and ended with "the renovation of the tripartite treaty between Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania concluded in 1934 in Geneva and registered in the League of Nations." The aim of the present meeting is to elaborate the legal status in the so-called transitional period and the platform for talks with Moscow.

It should be noted that contacts have been markedly activated recently at official and unofficial levels between representatives of the three republics in the search for paths for the most effective joint actions.

Thus, a few days ago a consultative and coordination meeting of representatives of the citizens' committees and Supreme Soviets of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia was held in Riga, failing for some reason to attract broad attention in the press. The result of the meeting was the creation of a new consultative organ—the permanent conference of Baltic states, whose activity is aimed "at restoring the actual independence of the Baltic republics."

The meeting in Yurmala which, incidentally, was held in camera, adopted a number of joint documents including a message to the USSR President with a call to begin joint talks.

After the meeting had ended a press conference was held at which journalists' questions were answered by V. Landsbergis, A. Gorbunov, and A. Ryuytel. Among others the following question was put: What aid to the Baltic republics expect from the future united Germany? To this A. Ryuytel replied that "Germany could help in implementing the Baltic republics' political aspirations" while V. Landsbergis added that World War II would still not be ended with the unification of Germany. In his opinion it will end with the solution of the "Baltic question."

Baltic Selective View of History Attacked

PM0806155590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Political observer V. Matveyev article: "Where to Go—Forward or Back?"]

[Text] The map of Europe will change considerably and be recarved if Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia secede from the Soviet Union. State borders will appear where there have been none throughout the postwar decades. The internal aspect of this, which affects the USSR's vital interests, is being covered in detail in our press and the foreign press, although this topic has not yet been exhausted. But there is an external, international aspect too, which is also very important.

Life advances the extremely topical task of reinforcing the key provisions of the Final Act of the all-European conference signed by the leaders of 33 European states, as well as of the United States and Canada, in Helsinki in 1975 with accords leading to the entire continent's unification within the framework of institutions and organs operating on a truly all-European basis. Politics, diplomacy, science, and public thought are already working intensively in many countries on versions of such unique establishments in the continent's history.

The need for them is particularly obvious in connection with the quickening process of Germany's unification. And this same process has demanded no less insistently the clear confirmation of the unshakable nature of the existing borders on the continent—that fundamental—I do not exaggerate—principle of the 1975 Final Act. Without it that historic document itself could not have appeared.

Europe's further progress would be equally inconceivable if this process—even within the confines of a single region—were not observed but violated. The Helsinki act does not permit any false interpretations in this respect. Any change of borders must provide for a peaceful, political procedure, i.e. rule out any one-sided, arbitrary actions or steps.

It cannot be denied that what happened in Vilnius 11 March and then in Riga and Tallinn was such a one-sided act running counter to the very logic of the political resolution of very complex problems: negotiations in the name of formulating a reasonable, concerted reply.

Instead, the path of "faits accomplis" was chosen, i.e. one that makes the negotiations themselves pointless.

Apart from everything else, decisions to secede concern not only the indigenous peoples of the Baltic region but also numerous national minorities which, incidentally, constitute a very relative minority in certain republics. Do these people, who have linked their destiny with the Soviet Baltic region and invested their labor for several decades in enhancing the well-being of these republics, really have no right to their own choice?

It is a question not of some "local dispute" but of our country's very destiny. In the Great Patriotic War the Soviet people defended their motherland's integrity against the threat of its dismemberment. The situation now is different, but those foreign commentators (and there are quite a lot of them) are right who point out that the state of affairs in the renewed federation of all Soviet republics depends to a considerable degree on the development of events in the Baltic region.

Mutual ties and channels of vital activity have formed between the Baltic republics and the rest of the union over the past 50 years of such a kind that to sever them by means of rash acts would be like cutting into a living body with a sharp knife.

The initiators of such steps declare that the situation in the Baltic region must return to the one that existed prior to 1940. In other words, the hands of the clock of history are being turned back, as it were.

Then let us be consistent and remember the circumstances in which independence was established in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia seven decades ago. Germany's forces of occupation were there then. To what end? To crush the revolutionary movement and liquidate people's power.

By a decree of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, which was proclaimed 24 December 1918 under the signatures of Sverdlov and Lenin in response to corresponding appeals from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, they were incorporated in "the free voluntary, and unbreakable union of working people of all the nations inhabiting the territory of the former Russian Empire."

So history is not unambiguous, if you address it in its entirety and not selectively.

Who, for example, would suspect V. Trump, the Lithuanian historian and supporter of the bourgeois republic who emigrated to the West, of having sympathies with people's power? But this is what he wrote in 1967 in the Western-published journal METMENIS: "During the 13 years of A. Smetona's rule the nation was so split that many people wondered what was preferable—to go along with the Soviet Union or to continue existing under Smetona's dictatorship, of which they were sick to the core of their being."

All the decisions of the new supreme legislative organs and the present leaders of the Baltic republics are founded exclusively on the invalidation of the 1939 Soviet-German treaty. And yet after that treaty, which in fact lost its force after Hitler's attack on the USSR 22 June 1941; Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia were occupied by Hitlerite troops. On the basis of the "OST" plan the Hitlerites planned to "assimilate" and Germanize those republics, i.e. to annihilate a section of the people, evict a section, and assimilate the remaining section. The Soviet Army saved the peoples of Lithuania, as well as the other Baltic republics, from annihilation and enslavement. The victory over fascist Germany returned Klaipeda, which had been wrested from Lithuania even before the "Molotov-Ribbentrop" pact, to Lithuania as part of the USSR. It made it possible to join the Vilnius metropolitan district [Wilenski Kray] with the republic—again only as part of the USSR.

What kind of future are those demanding "independence at all costs—and immediately" offering their peoples? This is a vital question. Evidently these leaders are not rushing ahead by chance. They do not want their peoples to find out for themselves in practice, through experience, what exactly is being offered to them by a radically renewed federation of Soviet republics, within the framework of which Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians will take their worthy place as masters of their own destiny. Why is this real alternative being cast aside by the present leadership in Vilnius, Riga, and Tallinn without first putting it to the test in practice?

Baltic representatives who recently visited Western capitals have complained that the officials with whom they spoke reacted cautiously to their statements. The support they had expected was not forthcoming.

But why do they feel surprised? It is not that anyone is choosing between Moscow and Vilnius. Many people in the West see these hasty steps under the mottoes of independence and secession from the USSR as a destabilization of the situation on the continent, which runs counter to the unquestionable positive, constructive achievements made recently in breaking down the barriers and obstacles of the "cold war."

The main point is that the continent is still divided into military-political groupings. The Warsaw Pact and NATO counterbalance one another. The Baltic is one of those key regions where a delicate balance of forces and interests is maintained.

Statements by the present Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian leaders that they are ready to hold talks with Moscow on a range of military issues were made after they had proclaimed their republics' independence unilaterally and counter to the norms and laws valid in the Soviet Union. In other words, first the very foundation of relations is cast in doubt and then, on this undermined basis, it is proposed to hold talks.

A game of hide-and-seek is not possible here. We are talking about existing borders being recarved and about postwar territorial realities in Europe being violated on a broad scale.

Some of the statements now being made in the Baltic capitals are seriously worrying. It has been reported, for example, that A. Ruutel, chairman of Estonia's legislative body, has "questioned" the need for a Soviet military presence in this region. This was said at a time when the need to fully preserve NATO's combat potential, including in the Baltic, was being indicated from official rostrums in Washington and London.

Under the 1975 Helsinki accords, which are still in effect, the arbitrary recarving of existing borders in Europe, under pressure, is illegal. Moscow cannot be expected to sanction the violation of these international legal norms.

The Baltic capitals must draw rational conclusions from this fact. The way to talks does not depend on Moscow but on the stance of the present Baltic leadership with regard to observing the legal norms and legality enshrined in the USSR Constitution.

Understandably, the development of events in the Baltic is being closely followed throughout the world—and particularly in Europe, with its hopes of better times.

However, the actions of current separatists are fraught with serious consequences in the sense that they could not only complicate revolutionary perestroyka in our country but also undermine the entire process of defusing international tension and negate the results achieved in recent years to reduce the danger of war and strengthen peace. Our perestroyka also has global importance.

Nothing impossible is being demanded of those who voted in Vilnius, Riga, and Tallinn for secession from the USSR. M.S. Gorbachev said this during his visit to the United States. The question must be decided by constitutional means. This presupposes the holding of a nationwide referendum in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Those in favor of secession from the USSR will present their option in the referendum, as will those favoring a different option. Let the people make the choice. It will take no less than five years, perhaps even seven, M.S. Gorbachev said, to look into all this....

A considerable number of the difficult problems which governments in Europe are having to work to resolve will disappear when the continent moves toward a free future without an arms race, without military confrontation, and within the framework of a reliable security system. Borders will, of course, remain, but they will serve as bridges rather than barriers—bridges to a broad, free exchange of material and spiritual values, people, and ideas. This is no longer a remote prospect but a practical reference point.

It is within this kind of framework that the Baltic republics will also acquire new political and economic scope for themselves. Together with other nations on the continent, Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians will go to meet the approaching 21st century confident of a better future and enjoying the necessary sovereignty for this. This future can and must be brought closer, not erecting barriers where there are none but lowering and removing those which exist at present. Work in this field deserves the maximum of joint effort.

RSFSR

Further on Sovereignty Issue Debate

LD1106122790 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Kirill Dibrova, and Dmitry Polunin]

[Text] Moscow, June 11 TASS—The First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation today began to discuss the declaration on state sovereignty of the Russian Federation article-by-article. On Friday the congress adopted the fundamental fifth point of the document, which proclaimed the supremacy of the Constitution and the laws of the Russian Federation on its entire territory.

Today's debates centered on how to adopt the declaration on state sovereignty of the Russian Federation—by simple or qualified majority.

Under the provisional regulations, a qualified majority is needed only to adopt amendments and changes to the existing Constitution of the republic, while all other legislative acts and resolutions are endorsed by a simple majority of votes.

On the one hand, the declaration is not a constitutional act and could be endorsed by a simple majority. On the other hand, a number of provisions of the declaration run counter to fundamental articles of the Constitution of the Russian Federation and require their change.

The reasoning of supporters of these two approaches was quite convincing. Yuriy Manayenkov, secretary of the central committee of the Soviet Communist Party told TASS that this debate is a natural development of democracy. He said that each proposal has some truth.

The deputy said he believed democracy is possible only when everybody participates in decision-making and said that the referendum on this matter would be the optimum variant.

Clergyman Vyacheslav Polosin assessed the debates differently. He believed a number of deputies were striving to prevent the adoption of the declaration. "Deplorably, the vice-president of the Supreme Soviet's ineffective conduct at today's meeting means that the declaration is being drowned out by words and that time is being wasted," he said. He said a businesslike approach is needed. Unnecessary debating should be stopped and voting should be conducted on different variants article-by-article.

A short break was announced to conduct the elections to fill vacancies in the republic's parliament. After the first round of the elections, 50 seats out of the 252 remained vacant.

Candidates to these seats were nominated by territorial delegations on the basis of quotas established for their regions.

But alternative candidatures were nominated, and there were cases when people nominated themselves.

A joint statement by the coordination councils of Communists of Russia and Democratic Russia groups of deputies was read before the elections. It urged deputies to vote for candidates recommended by territorial delegations.

Yeltsin on Alleged Ban of Television Interview

LD0906213890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1820 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Statement by RSFSR President Boris Yeltsin at RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 9 June—recorded]

[Text] I gave an interview to Central Television on the work of the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and appealed to miners to stabilize the situation in their regions and prevent further strikes. I asked all the people of Russia to give the Congress of People's Deputies a period of grace. The need for such an appeal has been stated many times by congress deputies, and on 8 June a decision was adopted at the Congress of People's Deputies. Despite the decision of the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the management of Central Television banned the transmission of my appeal, although the date of transmission—8 June—had been agreed with the chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, Comrade Nenahsev. I regard this instance as a planned political provocation organized by...well, to say the political leadership might be...[noise from hall] probably best to say the following: I regard this instance as a planned and organized political provocation. [noise from floor] It is an affront not only to the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, but to the entire congress, all deputies of Russia and their voters. I demand that respect be shown toward the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR.

Gorbachev Denies Blocking Broadcast

LD1106071890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0645 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Now we will switch to the Great Kremlin Palace. Marina Novitskaya is at the microphone.

[Novitskaya] Today a sitting of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Congress of People's Deputies has recently opened. It began with a speech by Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, member of the Presidential Council and USSR people's deputy.

He stated that USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has charged him with reading out an address to the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR. This address by the president says that the assertions by certain deputies and participants in the congress on 9 June—the Congress of the Russian Federation—on the participation of the president in delaying the television broadcast of the speech of Comrade Yeltsin, president of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, are pure fabrication. The president, as well as everyone else, found out that such an interview existed only from the discussions at the congress. He expresses hope that the special commission of the congress will clarify who needed this provocative escapade [zateya] and for what reason. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has also expressed the hope that the persons who launched attacks directed at him will make a public apology.

Speaking on his own behalf, Comrade Primakov added that the address by the USSR president to the Congress of People's Deputies of Russia is a call for profound responsibility.

A deputy also made an address, this time to Yeltsin, in the name of the constituent congress of independent trade unions of health workers. A demand was formulated on improving the health care situation in the republic. Unfortunately, this document ends with words on how, if urgent measures are not adopted, participants in the congress will resort to measures that are stipulated in the law on labor disputes.

Today, at last, the main issue of the agenda has been begun—the formation of the Supreme Soviet. As you know, in the previous round of elections about 50 deputies were not elected in both chambers. Now Sidorenko, chairman of the tellers' commission, is familiarizing deputies with new candidates for the vacant posts. With this I close my report from the Kremlin.

More on Denial

LD1106085690 Moscow TASS in English 0825 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—President Mikhaill Gorbachev denied parliamentary accusations of attempts to bar newly-elected Russian president from appearing on national TV at the Russian Congress here today.

Gorbachev's aide Yevgeniy Primakov, a member of the Presidential Council, took the floor at the Russian Federation's First Congress of People's Deputies to read out the following statement by Gorbachev:

"Statements by some deputies on June 9 of this year at the Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies about the involvement of the president of the USSR in the delay of the broadcast of Boris Yeltsin's interview on national television are fabricated. Moreover, I learnt about the interview only when this question was discussed at the congress.

"I request the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation to investigate who organised this provocation, and why. I hope that persons who made attacks in my direction will apologise in public.

Yours sincerely,

Gorbachev
President of the USSR.

"The country's political leadership intends to do all it can to consolidate the situation, and no one has plans to diminish the importance of the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation—a republic that is the backbone of the Soviet Union." Primakov added.

"The slanderous implication of the president in a case in which he has no connection whatsoever, is either political shortsightedness or an attempt by forces opposing the consolidation of our society to drive a wedge between the president of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet and the head of the Soviet State." Primakov stressed.

He said the president's address to the congress is an appeal for an augmented sense of responsibility."

Russian President Boris Yeltsin complained to Russian people's deputies on Saturday that his taped interview scheduled to be aired Friday night, was not broadcast despite an agreement with television leaders.

Soviet Television Chief Mikhail Nenashev was summoned by the congress. He told lawmakers that he unilaterally decided to postpone the broadcast of Yeltsin's interview until Saturday to make way for a joint press conference by Gorbachev and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

Lawmakers refused to accept his story, insisting that the Soviet leadership was behind the decision.

In his televised interview, Yeltsin spoke about the economic turmoil plaguing the Russian Federation, the largest of Soviet republics.

"We have a programme for two, maximum three years, to stabilize the situation and even improve living standards. This is why we need a credit of confidence," Yeltsin said, calling on the people to support the new Russian leadership.

Differences at the congress impede passage of laws, he said, but "we are not yet in a deadlock", he said.

The leadership of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet must not be connected with groups or blocks, he said, announcing that he has left the Democratic Russia block of lawmakers.

Yeltsin Interviewed on Congress Proceedings

LD0906190190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1425 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Interview with Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic President Boris Yeltsin by unidentified correspondent, place not given, on 7 June—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich, the congress has been at work for three weeks. I would like you to assess the work of the congress, how the congress is developing, how it is going, and what problems the Congress must solve in the very near future.

[Yeltsin] Of course, the congress is not taking place according to the scenario that the apparat had determined. At the first session, therefore, when the agenda was being confirmed, it was extended considerably, in contrast to the one prepared by the apparat, which amounted just to assembling, voting, and dispersing. We decided, instead, that we should discuss business issues, issues concerning the sovereignty of Russia, questions concerning the decree on authority, agrarian issues—that is to say, vital questions for people and for the people—and that we should not simply elect a Supreme Soviet and leadership and then that's that, then disperse.

The second feature, of course, is that there are 27 deputies' groups at the congress. The Russian congress did not take the route taken by the Union congress, which from the beginning banned altogether the existence of any deputies' groups. Remember that the Interregional Deputies' Group was not registered, either. It was like an illegitimate child. Here, though, we have taken the path that absolutely all deputies' groups which have declared themselves according to number, according to vocation, according to territory, according to any factor, are registered. And now there are 27 such groups. Of course, as a result, there is no stable majority of likeminded people here, as there is at the Congress of People's Deputies of the Union. Here there are more people who think in different ways. And because of this the resolution of every question is of course made more difficult.

[Correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich, 27 blocks, is that not a lot? And in general the position of the chairman must be neutral. That is difficult.

[Yeltsin] Yes, of course, 27 is a lot. It means additional difficulties, but I am convinced, and I state it officially, that the chairman and perhaps his deputies must not belong to any of the blocks. And I have left the Democratic Russia block. For the chairman the interests of all deputies must be defended to an identical degree.

[Correspondent] Observing the work of the congress, it seems to me that it is getting more and more difficult to find the kind of consensus of which you have spoken. How are you managing to find one and move forward on this complicated issue?

[Yeltsin] I think one has to be calm about this, and even when insulting words are aimed at me, one has to be calm about this, too, since the people's deputies still have little experience of parliamentary practice, and many are lacking in political culture as well. This could, after all, be seen at the all-Union congress and at the Union's Supreme Soviet—so almost every day I meet a deputies' group: it is a must. They invite me and every day, today, tomorrow, the day after, and the days already passed. I have, well, I have already met one third of the deputies' groups. Our conversations have been very interesting and they will continue. I think I will definitely meet all the groups, and this will lead precisely to greater understanding, I think, both of myself as the chairman on their part, and on my part of their outlooks and points of view. It seems to me that such an attitude of respect for every point of view has led to the fact that thus far the congress has not found itself in an impasse, although the Union congress, one remembers, did find itself in dead-end situations when entire republics and deputies from the republics left the hall, disagreeing with this or that decision. All the same, I think we will not end up in such impasses and will advance, slowly of course, and that is not to my liking either, but there are a thousand people and many who want to, who want to speak and express very wise and interesting thoughts and ideas which are sure to be used later on. Without a doubt they are also expressing the hopes of their voters. Meanwhile, there is the television reporting, and that, too, puts some part of...

[Correspondent] More responsibility?

[Yeltsin] More activity and more responsibility at the same time.

[Correspondent] Sometimes, you know, I notice that deputies want to express primarily their own point of view so that they are seen by their local people, sometimes even departing from the agenda. This is certainly the case. But, we all know that there is a very complex economic and social situation in Russia, in the Republic, and generally speaking we are expecting the congress to move on to these problems, the solution of these very serious, these very difficult, questions. At what point in the agenda of the congress will you begin to deal with this? I think that the Supreme Soviet will certainly be elected, and we want these complex problems to start being resolved.

[Yeltsin] Yes. We are not departing very far from the agenda, although we are 24 hours behind now. The Supreme Soviet election will apparently take place tomorrow and Saturday. Thereafter the congress will adopt a declaration on sovereignty.

[Correspondent] But that, too, I understand, will not be a simple...

[Yeltsin, interrupting] It will not be a simple issue, it will not be a simple one, because already today there are several alternative versions of the draft of this declaration, although the editorial commission did its work. Nevertheless, there are still alternatives, because this is the first time the question has been raised in such a way that there can be real political and economic sovereignty for Russia within our country. Then, there is the decree on authority; and then there is the agrarian question. We want to listen to the concept for the development of the agriculture of the Russian Federation, and then bring up this issue specially at an extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR in order to especially discuss the agrarian question, to discuss the key question of how, after all, we are going to improve the way in which people are fed, how to remove this very acute problem which is simply at the brink, I would say, of popular indignation.

I would also like to take advantage of today's meeting with the television viewers to mention a small misunderstanding which has made its appearance. It concerns statements by several Western media organizations quoting certain other sources—it is not clear which—that I, when commenting upon our meeting with Mrs. Margaret Thatcher, the prime minister of Britain, said that she had stated that Britain was willing to conclude an agreement with Russia. I say that that is a free interpretation of what we said. I said that Russia will, I hope, acquire real sovereignty, and the possibility of concluding agreements not only with other republics in our own country but with other countries, too, including Britain, bearing in mind the fact that we have great historic roots in the field of trade and so on, and that the conclusion of an agreement between Russia and Britain is thus possible. I always say that, of course, she is a very clever woman and prime minister, and she replied like this: First of all you get real sovereignty, and then we'll return to this question. That is precisely what was said between us, and what I mentioned to other mass information media.

And I would like to use the opportunity I have been given of giving an interview on television to simply tell all Russians that the situation is very complex—the economic situation, the crisis with the fall in the economic indicators which is taking place all the time, the supply of foodstuffs following the government's statement about raising prices—of course this has destabilized the situation in virtually all regions. The leaders of 27 oblasts and Moscow met yesterday and thought about how they could overcome this situation. I consider that we will nevertheless find a way out.

I would also like to reassure the miners in some way, of course. It will soon be the anniversary of their first strike, a very serious and powerful manifestation, so to speak, a manifestation of the people. They should now, nevertheless, refrain from those things which would destabilize the situation in the Russian Federation even more. It is so tense now that any spark, any unguarded action anywhere, or even any unguarded word, could quite simply create a conflagration.

I think that the Supreme Soviet will now be formed. There will then be a new government, a new government. I ask the voters and all Russians to believe that both the Supreme Soviet and the government do make, and will make, it their main and their foremost task and objective to find ways of helping our people to live, to live better, to find ways of overcoming this crisis situation and moving toward the improvement of life via the economy.

Yes, we have a 500-day program which will ensure not only stabilization of the situation, but a move toward improving the provision of consumer goods and food. In short, toward an improvement in the standard of living of the populace during the transition to a market economy. This program will—later, during discussion of the government program—be presented for anyone who wishes to study it. Therefore, we need a certain grace period from you, dear comrades. Two years, I would think. Two, two and a bit, three at the outside. We need these two or three years to stabilize the situation and improve the general position of the Russian Federation. This program exists. These are not mere words. There is both a program and an enormous desire. Unquestionably this depends on your own desire to create the local conditions necessary for this program to be implemented. I would simply ask you to make this grace period clear, and to trust us. Trust us as the new leaders of Russia. We really do, and will, take a very, very responsible attitude toward this. We must not let our electorate and all the peoples of our vast, almost 150 million-strong Russian Federation down.

[Correspondent] Boris Nikolayevich, how will you—how do you—regard the fact that some republics and some cities are entering into direct contacts with other republics? Will you continue with this policy or will you be searching for other means of contact?

[Yeltsin] I do not think that is a bad start in the transition to a market economy. It should be refined later on, with the conclusion of agreements between the Russian Federation and the other republics—political, economic, social, spiritual, cultural, ethnic, and so on. By reaching agreements with, let us suppose, all the other 14 republics, we will be creating a sort of basis for this market. That will then become a basis upon which to conclude a treaty of the Union. Of course, I realize that the unstable majority at the congress complicates matters and the adoption of radical solutions. If there is ever a critical point where an understanding cannot be reached, however, I will then go to the people. I will go to the electorate. Because we cannot now miss out on the historic moment when Russia must pursue its reforms more radically so we avoid marking time, as we have been for over five years, and instead take a step forward in all respects, though primarily with respect to raising people's living standards.

[Correspondent] Tell me, the country's government believes that a further six months are needed for the transition to a market economy. Difficult times are in store for the Republic and the country. How, in this difficult time—as you so rightly said—can you, as chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, act to avoid destabilizing the economy?

[Yeltsin] We have our own alternative program for Russia, which will not lead to a decline in people's living standards during the transition to a market economy. That is the fundamental difference between our program and the government—the Union—program. Therein lies the difference. In their program, everything is heaped on the shoulders of the people, while in ours that is not the case. By using different economic levers we can ensure that people's standards of living do not fall, and indeed should rise in time.

[Correspondent] And will this matter be discussed at the congress?

[Yeltsin] This problem will not be discussed at this congress. It will be discussed as a program of the government. When a new chairman, when someone or other is confirmed as chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, he will set out this program in sufficient detail. I would once more like to call upon all the peoples, the many peoples of our great Russian Federation, at this very difficult transitional time, this very, very difficult time—one of the most difficult ones, perhaps, in many years—to find within themselves the courage to support the new leadership, so that we can then get the situation moving by our joint efforts. I say once again that I am cutting down the timescale, and I consider it to be realistic: two years of stabilization, and in the third year improvement. Once again, I repeat, once again, I call upon people to be very even-tempered in their attitudes to all the actions that are now taking place there in the localities, and to the processes which are now taking place, unfortunately not just in our own Russian Federation but in the country in response to certain ill-considered decisions. I would like to thank the voters and all those Russians—and not just Russians, many people from our country—who have sent thousands and thousands of telegrams congratulating me on my election as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. I will do everything to justify this very great, this enormous confidence that has been shown by the people. Thank you.

Moscow TV Relays 9 June Congress Proceedings

Yeltsin on TV Broadcast

LD0906164990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 9 June carries a recorded relay of the 9 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin.

Deputies rise to honor the RSFSR flag. Yeltsin asks them to register: 748 deputies are present and the quorum figure is 707.

At 1504 GMT Leningrad deputies complain that their voting system is not working.

At 1506 GMT Yeltsin makes the following announcement:

"In accordance with your decision, I have spoken on television and addressed the people of Russia, conveying the approximate gist of the requests expressed by you and the miners. I spoke to Nenashev for 20 minutes. He said that all was in order and that the interview was to be broadcast after the 'Vremya' program. You remember that the congress specially demanded that the program should be transmitted on television. It was filmed. I think that you are very literate people. It was of course filmed by television but I do not think, especially after my conversation with Nenashev, that he was the one to blame.

"I believe that that was an affront to the Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR and to the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, who, according to the law, should have been provided with a television channel, not only as the chairman but also as a people's deputy of the USSR. And according to the law, the showing of the program should have been permitted. Even more so, considering that what was involved was the decision of the Congress of People's Deputies.

"I believe, I think that this is an affront in general for all the voters of our republic and indeed for all the peoples of our republic. I believe we should voice our protest and I think that if we were able to adopt the declaration today, and it is in precisely this direction that the group is working, then after the adoption of the declaration which says that everything situated in the territory of our republic is its property, the television service would be declared the property of Russia and we would then consult as to what extent to concede the center. Since, once such a disgraceful step, offending our dignity as people's deputies and as a congress, has been taken, this means that it could be repeated again in the future.

something is not permissible. It is not just discrimination against an individual and against human rights but against the republic's supreme body of power, the Congress of People's Deputies, as a whole.

"I am asking that you vote for such a statement. Who is in favor of voting by name for such a statement? Please vote."

Following some difficulty with the electronic voting system, the call for voting by name is approved.

At 1517 GMT Deputy Novikov says this television incident is very serious and a commission is needed to investigate it. He says a statement could be taken after a commission reports.

At 1518 GMT another deputy is against the creation of a commission on this subject. He thinks Nenashev should be summoned to the congress to explain why the interview was not shown. Only then should a decision be taken.

At 1519 GMT Deputy Kopeyka, a media deputy, says he was also offended by the television postponement. He wants a commission and a face-to-face explanation by Nenashev. At 1521 GMT a deputy says this is a political matter arising from the fact that obviously Yeltsin is not to the liking of the command- administrative system.

At 1524 GMT Deputy Maleyev calls the incident a provocation. A commission is needed.

TV Chief on Dispute

LD0906165890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 9 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin.

At 1525 GMT Deputy Fadeyev calls for television officials to be summoned to the congress. Other deputies express similar views.

At 1527 GMT Yeltsin states that First Deputy Chairman Khasbulatov has just gone off to telephone Nenashev to summon him to the congress in line with the deputies' wishes.

At 1531 GMT Voronin says that Yeltsin's interview, according to Nenashev, will be broadcast today immediately after the "Vremya" program.

At 1533 GMT Yeltsin says that Khasbulatov says Nenashev is unable to come to the congress at present because he is with Gorbachev.

At 1535 GMT Deputy Gurevich says all sides of the incident should be heard. The deputy says Nenashev should give the congress an explanation.

At 1538 GMT Yeltsin proposes that Gurevich be entrusted with drawing up a list of members of a commission to monitor relations with the media. Yeltsin takes a vote on this proposal. The proposal is passed: 766 votes in favor, 29 against, and 13 abstentions.

At 1540 GMT a deputy says that the congress must show good sense, but personally requests Nenashev to attend the congress.

At 1545 GMT another deputy says the congress request to Yeltsin to make his appeal on television arose from the situation in the Kuzbass—an urgent situation where a strike was being threatened. The deputy says that Gorbachev is really the one to answer to the congress for the postponement of the interview.

At 1548 GMT a deputy complains of the high-handed actions of the party apparatus. She says Gorbachev should be summoned to the congress to answer to the deputies.

At 1550 GMT a deputy says that yesterday Yarin, a member of the Presidential Council, said that the RSFSR Congress needs to grow up. He thinks that this was an affront to the congress.

More deputies complain of the "affront" to the congress.

At 1600 GMT an adjournment is declared.

Voting Results Read

LD0906175490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 9 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 1614 GMT, following the adjournment, (Kaltunov) from the military calls for consideration of each decision, each word of the congress. The disorder of the other republics must not be carried to the Russian republic, he says. He calls for organization and discipline. He urges a meeting between Gorbachev and Yeltsin, and not for a hasty declaration.

At 1616 GMT a deputy says that sovereignty will not be gained without opposition. This is not a personal conflict, but planned limitation of Russian sovereignty. He proposes ceasing the debate until Nenashov arrives.

At 1619 GMT voting takes place on this proposal. The proposal is accepted by 685 votes, 115 against, and five abstentions.

At 1621 GMT Yeltsin asks if the tellers' commission is ready to report. Deputy Tikhonov, on procedural matters, asks for named voting on whether Yeltsin can make a statement on the television incident. Yeltsin replies that it is more logical to wait for Nenashov. Yeltsin proposes going on to other business, for which the tellers' commission is preparing. There is a pause whilst deputies talk among themselves.

At 1625 GMT Yeltsin proposes a report on the evacuees' situation. A secretariat spokesman says that the RSFSR Council of Ministers has provided information on Azerbaijani evacuees, which he passes on, regarding numbers in the RSFSR and those who have returned to Baku. Local soviets have been activated in dealing with evacuees. Funds are being allocated by the RSFSR Council of Ministers to deal with the refugee problem. He then answers a query on aid to those who suffered in the Bashkir tragedy. The RSFSR Council of Ministers has allocated R200 million, he says.

At 1632 GMT Sidorenko, chairman of the tellers' commission presents a report. The results of the secret ballot for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet have been processed. He starts to read the list of candidatures again, but Yeltsin stops him. Yeltsin asks for a vote on reading the results of the ballot. The decision is adopted by 795 votes. Sidorenko therefore reads the number of votes cast for each candidate to the council of of the republic, going through the autonomous republics, krays and oblasts of the RSFSR in alphabetical order. He then goes on to read the deputies who have been elected to the Soviet of the Republic, in spite of objections from the floor: 81 deputies have been elected, 45 vacancies remain. There is an explanation as to why a certain Kazakov was not included in the voting: he proposes voting now for Kazakov of Krasnodar kray.

At 1715 GMT a deputy proposes taking a break for an hour prior to confirming the tellers commission protocol. There is further discussion of the Kazakov candidacy. Yeltsin asks Sidorenko if the protocol can be confirmed without Krasnodar Kray; Sidorenko says it is possible. Yeltsin proposes a break to consult. There will thus be a repeat vote for Krasnodar Kray along with the 45 vacancies.

At 1738 GMT Sidorenko proposes an hour's break, as there have been other queries concerning the tellers commission's protocol. Yeltsin says that the results on the Soviet of Nationalities remain to be announced and suggests interruping the results if Nenashev arrives. Sidorenko goes on to read the results of voting for this chamber.

Speech Delay Explained

LD0906191790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 9 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin. At 1803 GMT Sidorenko says 121 of 126 candidates have been elected to the Soviet of Nationalities. A deputy announces one candidate has stepped down; Sidorenko says the withdrawal is too late. There are proposals to confirm the protocol of the tellers commission on elections to the Soviet of Nationalities.

At 1815 GMT deputies vote against a role-call vote on the protocols, but this is because the deputies in favor of a break didn't vote. So they will now vote on whether to vote on the protocols. This is also rejected, again because there is no quorum. The protocol on elections to the Soviet of Nationalities is put to the vote: this is also rejected. Yeltsin suggests a break.

At 1820 GMT Yeltsin reads a statement giving the background to his television interview, and condemning the decision of Gosteleradio (State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting) not to broadcast it as a provocation.

At 1822 GMT Nenashev is invited to take the floor. He provides background to the incident, noting the decision to postpone Yeltsin's interview was a result of changes to yesterday's "Vremya" program because of the Thatcher-Gorbachev press briefing.

At 1827 GMT Yeltsin adds further details on his understanding of when the interview was to be broadcast, noting promises were received that it would be broadcast on Friday. He reaffirms his statement.

At 1830 Deputy Babkin points out Yeltsin's constitutional right to address the nation and suggests that a commission look into the matter.

At 1832 GMT Deputy Tarasov says the situation in the country has to be taken into account: let's be sensible about this. Yeltsin points out that they want questions to Nenashev, not speeches. Another deputy asks Nenashev: Didn't he know there would be the Thatcher briefing? Could he not have informed Yeltsin? Nenashev repeats his former points in reply.

At 1835 GMT a deputy asks: Don't you think you have placed yourself above the president of the RSFSR? Haven't you insulted the congress? Nenashev says it was an extraordinary decision, and he doesn't think it was an insult.

At 1836 GMT another deputy says it is not Yeltsin, but those who make such decisions who are worsening the situation in the country. He adds that Raisa Gorbacheva is constantly appearing on the television, although she occupies no elective post. Nenashev says he has never received any calls or instructions from Raisa.

At 1840 GMT another deputy says Nenashev is experienced enough to know that he had no right to act like this. Nenashev again offers his denials. A commentator from Murmansk radio says Yeltsin had intended to stabilize the situation in the country, and that such delays cost a great deal. He expresses no-confidence in Nenashev. Nenashev points out difficulties in announcing such matters in the press.

At 1845 GMT Nenashev says he answers for everything he says here, that he will answer to the commission. Serious matters must not be affected by passions in this way. He reaffirms that there will not be any changes of content to the Yeltsin interview.

At 1846 GMT the relay breaks off in middle of Nenashev speaking. The announcer says there will now be a football game. She says the relay will resume later, but does not specify when.

More on Elections

LD0906220290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2100 GMT on 9 June resumes its recorded relay of the 9 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin.

Yeltsin tells deputies that before the congress it was suggested to him by Central Television that a half-hour profile of candidates for the chairmanship of the congress should be made by Vladimir Pozner, among others. Vlasov's was done, but Yeltsin's was banned on instructions from above.

Nenashev answers this. He says that Yeltsin has forgotten about a large interview which Yeltsin gave on Leningrad television. He says that the profile as well would have been showing bias in favor of Yeltsin. He is jeered.

At 2107 GMT Yeltsin says that the whole country cannot see Leningrad television.

Deputy Zolotukhin proposes that the congress support a resolution asking for Nenashev's resignation. Yeltsin puts to the vote the adoption of a resolution today, which is rejected. A second proposal—for the commission to look into the matter and report—is adopted.

At 2112 GMT a one-hour break is announced.

At 2113 GMT the recorded relay resumes. Yeltsin gives the floor to Deputy Lyubimov, who says there have been irregularities in voting for the protocols; he says 150 deputies have been blocking the vote. He proposes closer adherence to the standing orders and proposes congratulating Patriarch Aleksey on his election to his new post. Lyubimov demands to know who is dragging out the Supreme Soviet election procedure—the voting results should be published by name in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, he says. He concludes by urging the deputies to vote on the Supreme Soviet before today's meeting ends.

At 2121 GMT Deputy Manokhin from Novosibirsk makes a statement on behalf of the Democratic Russia bloc. The make-up of the proposed Supreme Soviet does not reflect the views of the congress deputies or of the electorate whom they represent. The Democratic Russia bloc therefore demands an adjournment of several days for proper consultation.

At 2123 GMT Deputy Matushkin, on behalf of the group of Independent deputies Coordination Council, suggests endorsing the commissions protocol and asks the Moscow and Leningrad deputies to cease blocking the Supreme Soviet election. People are tired of our confrontation, he says it is time to progress.

At 2125 GMT Deputy Ryumin from Ryazan says that given the circumstances the congress should break for "about 10 days," during which time Yeltsin should speak to Gorbachev and the problems be ironed out.

At 2127 GMT Deputy Rumyantsev speaks. We have "blocked" the election procedure, he says, because we do not accept the amendment to Article 107 of the Constitution. There are three ways ahead. First, if the 126-126 option goes ahead the Russian communist group will have an unrepresentative majority in the Supreme Soviet. Second, we could start afresh and change Article 107 to state that the Supreme Soviet be "formed" rather than "elected" by the congress. Third, the "congress equals Supreme Soviet" option, which gained most support in polling, could be adopted. Rumyantsev suggests a break until a week from Monday for political consultations between Yeltsin and Gorbachev and between the deputies and their voters.

At 2131 GMT a deputy says: we have no tradition of compromise in our political culture, and unfortunately, neither the Democratic Russia nor the so-called Russian Communist blocs seem willing to make concessions. The blocking tactic is a "dangerous and a mistaken policy." We must finish electing the Supreme Soviet, he says. The congress will still have a legal influence on the Surpeme Soviet, plus the right to reelect it in the future. The country is "on the brink of disaster" at the moment and the stakes are too high to continue this confrontation.

At 2136 GMT Deputy Nesterov points out that it was the Democratic Russia bloc that gave most support to Yeltsin in his election. As most of its deputies have been removed from the proposed list of Supreme Soviet members, that body will end up in opposition to Supreme Soviet Chairman Yeltsin. It will also be unrepresentative of the people.

At 2138 GMT Deputy Zakharov says the only important thing is to get out of the present crisis. We must finish electing the Supreme Soviet and get down to work. He proposes a repeat second round of voting, taking into account the views of territories that have proposed their own candidates. To overcome deadlock in the election of the USSR Supreme Soviet a lottery was proposed, Zakharov says: this could be used to overcome the bloc divisions within the RSFSR congress.

Consensus Urged

LD0906224990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 9 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 2142 GMT Deputy Silayev, representing the majority of Kaluga deputies, proposes endorsing the tellers' commission protocol with the exception of the Krasnodar deputies. The latter group should be re-ballotted, he says. He appeals to Yeltsin to use his authority to help achieve consensus.

At 2145 GMT Deputy Chernov objects to the term "Communists of Russia" bloc. He is a communist himself but has nothing to do with the group. The name should be dropped. Further, he complains that not a single miner has been put on the Supreme Soviet list. This is a blow against the working class of Russia, he says to applause.

At 2146 GMT Deputy Travkin says there is no crisis at all; the congress is in a normal democratic predicament. Each side is doing its best to eliminate the other from the Supreme Soviet list. We do not have the right to adjourn, he says. The Democratic Russia bloc is badly organized and should form a proper parliamentary faction to uphold its interests. 126 members in each Supreme Soviet chamber is insufficient, Travkin says. We shall be obliged to increase the numbers at an extraordinary congress session. Winding up, Travkin points out that the congress has agreed to introduce presidential rule in Russia in the near future; if a conservative parliament really is elected today the mistake can be put right by the president himself.

At 2152 GMT Deputy Yakunin regrets that the Kuzbass miners have been dropped from the Supreme Soviet list. He suggests breaking for a couple of days; this would be better than leading the country into a serious crisis.

At 2155 GMT Yeltsin asks who is in favor of ending the debate: most are. What next? asks Yeltsin. The Supreme Soviet election has to be completed. Is the tellers' commission capable of working on, having stayed awake all last night? asks Yeltsin. Deputies confer. There are two proposals: to finish the election today following a short recess, or to break until Wednesday so that deputies can think about things. Yeltsin throws the floor open to suggestions.

A deputy says there is a third, compromise, option. The Moscow and Leningrad deputies could present a list of candidates corresponding to the number of posts available, this list to be endorsed or rejected by the congress. Other deputies put forward further ideas.

At 2205 Yeltsin proposes resuming at 1000 on Monday, and puts it to the vote: adopted. Appeals come from the floor to vote on the protocols from tellers commission. Elections to decide vacancies is to be held on Monday. There is discussion on how and when to vote on the protocols. Yeltsin puts to the vote approval of the tellers commission's report. The proposal to have roll-call vote is adopted. A vote on whether to hold nominations today on remaining vacancies is also adopted.

At 2220 GMT deputies suggest holding nominations and continuing work tomorrow. Yeltsin points out that this will be difficult for absent deputies to react so quickly to a change of plans. Yeltsin announces a break for an hour, to allow deputies groups to draw up lists and pass them to the secretariat.

At 2225 GMT the recorded relay resumes. Yeltsin says the Moscow nominations are not yet ready and suggests another 10 minutes. Shall we start on the lists of nominations that are ready? Yeltsin begins to read them. There are arguments over nominations.

Nominations Continue

LD1006002190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2226 GMT on 9 June continues its recorded relay of the 9 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow.

Further nominations for vacancies in the Supreme Soviet are put forward, as are various proposals, objections, explanations on procedure.

At 2310 GMT nominations are continuing, including arguments over nominations for the Moscow region.

At 2330 GMT nominations continue, including a proposal for resolving the Kazakov question in Krasnodar Kray. Kazakov then withdraws his candidacy. Various deputies continue to take the floor with various proposals, appeals, and so forth. Mostly but not exclusively with reference to resolving the nominations for Moscow and Leningrad.

At 2345 GMT nominations and debates over Moscow and Leningrad nominations continue.

At 0000 GMT on 10 June the recorded relay concludes.

Congress Elects Supreme Soviet Deputies

LD0906115890 Moscow TASS in English 1106 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary corespondents Lev Aksenov, Kirill Dibrova, and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow, June 9 TASS—The results of the election to the Supreme Soviet (parliament) were announced at the morning sitting of the Russian Federation's First Congress of People's Deputies today. The parliament's each chamber [as received] is to consist of 126 deputies.

Eighty-one deputies were elected on an alternative basis to the Council of the Republic chamber. There are 45 vacancies as other deputies failed to receive the required number of votes. Representatives from Moscow, Leningrad and some other regions have not been elected so far.

A total of 121 deputies have been elected to the Council of Nationalities chamber. The congress has not yet approved the protocols submitted by the counting commission. The congress decided to make an hour's break for consultations.

President of the Supreme Soviet Boris Yeltsin made a statement that his pre-taped television address to Russia's population had not been shown. He said it had been a "planned and organised political provocation" and called it an "insult for the president of the Russian parliament, the congress, all Russian deputies and the electorate."

Chairman of the State Television and Radio Committee Mikhail Nenashev, summoned before the congress, said the decision to adjourn the broadcasting of Yeltsin's address until Saturday, June 9, had been made by himself.

The decision was prompted by the overload of the Friday television programme when a joint news conference of British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and President Mikhail Gorbachev was broadcast, he said. Nenashev said his decision was by no means aimed at diminishing the Russian Federation's higher executive's role.

Deputies were not satisfied with Nenashev's explanations. The congress decided to set up a commission to examine the incident. [Moscow World Service in English at 1100 GMT on 9 June in a report on the 9 June morning session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies, says that "since many of the candidates failed to collect the required number of votes, the congress will consider the possibilities of another voting."]

'Acute Polemics' at Congress Session Noted

LD0906170690 Moscow TASS in English 1539 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Kirill Dibrova and Dmitiy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS—The afternoon session of the First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation today began with acute polemics.

Following announcement of the results of Friday's election of Russian parliament members, it turned out that 50 seats in the two chambers of parliament (45 in the Council of the Republic and five in the Council of Nationalities) remained vacant because a number of candidates did not poll the necessary majority vote.

All candidates for seats in the council of the republic from Moscow, Leningrad and a number of other territories were voted down.

Some deputies that are members of the Democratic Russia group found themselves among the losers. A number of representatives of the group suggested announcing a break in the congress's work.

Other deputies suggested transforming the entire congress into a parliament. Some members of the Democratic Russia group, Nikolay Travkin (Moscow), in particular, called on like-minded people not to resort to the tactics of blocking the congress's work and take the defeat in their stride.

Following a long quest for ways out of the impasse that developed at the congress, people's deputies by a majority of votes declared in favour of the idea to continue work on Monday, June 11, and to hold an additional election to fill the vacant seats in parliament.

The nomination of candidates to the republican parliament proceeded in an eager atmosphere. It was earlier agreed that the names of candidates should be suggested after a preliminary discusson by territorial deputations. A definite number of candidates was to be suggested.

However, in a number of cases, there were instances of self- nomination and alternative candidacies. A debate on a complex situation that was brought about by the repeat nomination of candidates from Moscow and Leningrad took rather much time. In both cases there were also alternative candidates.

Moscow TV Relays 8 June Congress Proceedings

Election Procedures Explained

LD0806165290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 8 June begins to carry a recorded relay of the 8 June session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 1400 GMT Boris Yeltsin is seen chairing the session.

At 1410 GMT the procedure for the election of members of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is being explained.

At 1415 GMT Plotnikov expresses his concern that Article 23 on the number of candidates running for parliamentary posts should stay as it stands. Two more deputies speak on the same subject. Yeltsin intervenes by saying that what is at issue now is which voting slips should be considered invalid. Deputy Tikhonov proposes that among the candidates involved the one who receives two thirds of votes should be elected. Yeltsin says that it is sufficient for a candidate to receive over 50 percent to be elected. The proposal is put to vote and carried.

At 1433 GMT Sidorenko says there are 20 voting booths and suggests ways of avoiding a crush during the vote. More booths could not be arranged, he regrets. A number of deputies intervene on the voting procedure, wondering how long will it take, stressing the need to ensure a secret ballot, and asking whether the vote should be taken row by row. Yeltsin says it's very difficult to work out how long will be needed. A deputy calls for a two-hour break so everyone can study the ballot-papers and vote. Yeltsin asks people to stay within the Georgiyevskiy Hall if they can. He calls a two-hour break, and this is agreed.

At 1449 GMT a Kuzbass deputy asks for an expression of sympathy following a recent mine accident and also appeals for no strikes while the RSFSR government is being formed.

At 1552 GMT Yeltsin says that the drafting commission will draw up a message of sympathy. He says that he is going to ask the television authorities to allow him to address the "citizens of Russia."

At 1555 GMT Deputy Samoylov from Chita withdraws his candidacy. Yeltsin reads out a message from another deputy—Semeykhin—who wishes to withdraw. Semeykhin comes to the rostrum and says that family reasons compel him to pull out.

At 1557 GMT an unidentified deputy proposes a vote on the proposed television address, which must be a congress decision and not a decision by some politburo member.

At 1558 GMT Yeltsin says that such things have happened, so let's vote. There is agreement by a show of hands.

At 1559 GMT there are more withdrawals from individual deputies. A deputy suggests a statement on sovereignty prior to the television address. Yeltsin says there is no need.

At 1505 GMT Yeltsin asks Tiyunov to talk about the proposed statement on RSFSR sovereignty. Tiyunov says five more draft declarations have been tabled on sovereignty. The editorial commission discussed it, he notes. The question of autonomous formations' relations with the RSFSR was discussed, he says, and most proposals have been taken into account. He stresses the importance of the formation of a law-governed state, within the USSR, the importance of the RSFSR's relations with the USSR on the basis of new treaty. A new Union treaty is needed, he says. A deputy had said the RSFSR could not have the right to leave the USSR, according to Tiyunov. But another said all republics have this right by virtue of the original agreement. Various deputies' proposals have been taken into account on Union citizenship, on the question of language, and a law on the languages of the RSFSR. On the question of the coming into force of the declaration, he notes that some want it to come into force immediately.

At 1517 GMT Yeltsin suggests written questions to the rapporteur and stipulates that words from the rostrum should have a time limit of one hour. He proposes five minutes for each speaker. Best to have written questions. Yeltsin proposes a vote on the debate of one hour without the commission's report. The decision is adopted. A vote on the five minutes' limit is adopted. A vote on taking the editorial commission's report as a basis is adopted. Applause. Members of the commission have their own opinion. Deputy Polyakov asks to speak.

At 1525 GMT Polyakov says he agrees with what the commission has done. On point nine he makes a proposal on krays and oblasts. The declaration on sovereignty says nothing about the krays of Russia, he notes. At the moment everything is done in the krays on command from the center—budget, everything. Therefore it proposed in point nine to add: "not contradicting interests of krays and oblasts."

Sovereignty Debated

LD0806211490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 8 June resumes its recorded relay of proceedings at the 8 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin. Yeltsin reopens the session and the first speaker is Samkaisi, who speaks about the proposed declaration of Russian sovereignty. He says the declaration has its merits. We must leave the framework of the Soviet Constitution, but with the least disruption, he says. Whatever we may say about pluralism, how could Lithuania stay in the Union without being called socialist.

At 1810 GMT Deputy Pak talks about the declaration. It is of world importance. It needs to be discussed with wisdom. Deputies in the hall meanwhile are seen studying a document and talking among themselves. Pak says the declaration reminds us that the process of European confederation is taking decades. One thing is certain: sovereignty of the Russian Federation. He stresses the importance of raising GNP to raise living standards and remove ethnic conflict.

At 1816 GMT Yeltsin says his time is up. Pak continues briefly in support of the declaration.

At 1818 GMT Deputy Golovin speaks of the rare unanimity on this subject: he emphasizes two main points: dominance of Russian law and priority of Russian law over Soviet. He speaks for the Smena group. He says the declaration could be shorter, and mentions an alternative version for points.

At 1822 GMT Deputy Zhigurin from Chukotka is called to speak but is absent.

At 1823 GMT Deputy Kluyev is called on to speak. He speaks of responsibility for Russians of this and future generations. The declaration heralds a new Constitution of Russia. State sovereignty and economic sovereignty will bring the country's potential to life, he claims. He speaks about the damage to the environment as seen in Chelyabinsk Oblast which he represents. He emphasizes point nine on sovereignty of local soviets. He calls for a strong Union.

At 1827 GMT Deputy Aleksandrov of the Group of Communists of Russia speaks. He notes his differences with Golovin. But what unites us? Service to the Russian people. The declaration of sovereignty should be a start of Russia's new life, he says. He mentions rights and liberties of its citizens. People without rights cannot be sovereign. He also refers to illogical points and inconstitiences in the declaration.

At 1833 GMT Slobodkin speaks of two concepts of sovereignty, our duty to future generations and the need for loyalty to the Union of SSR. At the same time the republic will build its relations with the Union on defense and foreign policy, he says that if this is concluded there will be no more Union, the Union will dissolve. Noting that Starovoytova asked if other republics will blockade the RSFSR, he says our country is no testing ground for mad ideas. Slobodkin says the declaration should have a point on autonomy in all matters except those which are the domain of the USSR. A new Constitution should be adopted after signing of a new treaty. He calls for compromise, i.e. adoption of the declaration as he has formulated it.

At 1839 GMT Temirov speaks of our duties in our multi-ethnic state. He notes the need to see the place of Russia in the USSR, and pleas against separatism, which could be imitated by other republics. He wants a good treaty while preserving the USSR. He opposes the adoption of the declaration without consultation with electors. It is a guide for all other republics and autonomous formations inside the RSFSR.

At 1845 GMT Shelokhbayev says the concept of the document should not be changed. He mentions a few repetitive details in the declaration.

At 1850 GMT Shabat says we are for the first time adopting legislation on the sovereignty of Russia. Point five needs to stipulate the priority of Russian law. There have been various speeches, but all those who spoke want the same thing. It is just their approaches that are different.

At 1856 GMT Deputy Polenov wants to focus on one point in the declaration—spiritual values. Much has been lost in the spiritual and cultural sphere in the past 70 years. Only four deputies associated with culture have been elected to the congress. That is the result of the past 70 years and of the stagnation. So now we want the spiritual and cultural potential of Russia to be realized. "Good morals are better than good laws," he stresses.

At 1900 GMT Yeltsin says the time allotted for debate has ended. He calls Oleg Ivanovich Polyakov of the editorial commission to comment briefly on some of the specific suggestions and amendments that have been aired. He asks to whom will Union-level enterprises belong. This question, he says, should be resolved in line with the Union Treaty of 1922.

At 1917 GMT Yeltsin says all the questions have been answered. Now there is the following proposal: although there has been a certain narrowing of views, the commission will be unable to examine all the amendments by the end of today's session. Therefore the proposal is to let the commission get on with it and let it present a reworked draft declaration on Wednesday.

Declaration Debated

LD0806213190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1919 GMT on 8 June continues its recorded relay of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow Kremlin. Discussion continues to focus on the draft declaration of Russian sovereignty. Deputy Rumenchuk suggests that it would be a better idea and quicker to adopt the declaration article by article without troubling the editorial commission with reworking it.

At 1920 GMT Deputy Sbranshko suggests Article 16 and another be put to the vote now. Another deputy warns against feverish legislation and supports the draft being put to the editorial commission for reworking.

At 1922 GMT Deputy Rumyantsev objects to the draft being postponed for further reworking. It risks becoming even more confusing than it already is.

At 1925 GMT Deputy Grigoryev proposes that the draft declaration be put to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet for reworking.

At 1926 GMT another deputy takes issue with individual words contained in certain paragraphs, but Yeltsin interrupts him to say he is reading from the old draft. The deputy perists but Yeltsin reminds him that the debate has ended and now the floor is only open to procedural issues.

At 1928 GMT Deputy Fedoseyev proposes that the declaration be postponed to the Second Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

At 1929 GMT Deputy Kitkin from Tula makes the point that the world essentially identifies Russia with the USSR.

At 1930 GMT Deputy Magurin says this is the most important document of the congress and must not be postponed for the Second Congress.

At 1931 GMT Deputy Rebrikov points out that the document cannot be put to a referendum since the procedure for holding referenda has not been worked out.

At 1932 GMT Deputy Kulakovskiy wants the declaration adopted as soon as possible. He proposes that a decree on power be adopted along with the declaration.

At 1933 GMT Deputy Volkov wants to ease the burden of the editorial commission by voting now on points five and six of the draft.

At 1934 GMT Deputy Mashkov considers that the declaration must be adopted at the First Congress. This draws a round of applause.

At 1935 GMT Deputy Morozov says the deputies should not leave the hall until the declaration is adopted. To this end he suggests a vote by name on each and every article.

At 1936 GMT Deputy Golovin says there must be no postponement of adoption. On the machinery of debates: he suggests article by article, with voting by name and registration by name.

At 1937 GMT Deputy (?Kozhikin) says the only way of saving the Union is to adopt the decision on Russian sovereignty and then working from that point of departure.

At 1938 GMT an unidentified deputy points out that the congress has already essentially agreed to let RSFSR law prevail over USSR law.

At 1939 GMT Deputy Bystrov sees sovereignty as the sum total of economic, political, and social considerations, and to this end attempts to introduce an amendment.

At 1940 GMT Deputy Smirnov quotes the proverb: "Don't put off until tomorrow what you can and must do today."

At 1941 GMT Deputy Zakharov says the declaration must not be sent to the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR, since he has a feeling that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet will prove much less radical than the congress.

At 1942 GMt Deputy Lugovoy says we have no right to let our voters down. The declaration must be passed article by article.

At 1943 GMT the deputies are invited to vote for an end to the debate. They vote: 771 in favor; 25 against; six abstentions.

More on Debates

LD0806214590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1944 GMT on 8 June continues its recorded relay of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin. Yeltsin says there have been 12 proposals on how to proceed further. Everyone realizes that the document is of great importance, and it is of little significance whether it takes three or so days more to pass it. What is important is that it be adopted at this First Congress. This draws applause. The document will not suffer from further reworking: quite the reverse. He proposes no days off for the editorial commission but instead work until Wednesday and then present it to the congress. Point five is, he says, the most fundamental point on which sovereignty hinges. To this end, he suggests putting point five to the vote.

At 1950 GMT deputies are invited to the microphone to comment on this proposal. Deputy Zakharov criticizes Yeltsin's decision to impose a time limit on the debate. Yeltsin wants a vote on cutting short the debate: 761 are in favor; 35 against; six abstentions.

At 1954 GMT deputies register for a vote: 822 are present—well over the quorum. The vote is on: let the commission carry on working on the draft and present the finished product to the congress on Wednesday. It also advocates work on a resolution and presenting a draft resolution on RSFSR state sovereignty. It also calls for an address to the other Union republics on drawing up a Union treaty. Point five should be voted on later and separately. Deputies are called on to vote now.

At 1958 GMT the vote is: 809 in favor; 48 against; four abstentions. Now a vote is taken on whether to vote on point five separately. They vote: 550 in favor; 254 against; 21 abstentions. So, point five, is to be voted on: first in its first versions, then in its second version, and then amendments. There is a vote on whether to have the vote by name. Result: 610 in favor; 179 against; nine abstentions. So the voting is to be by name.

At 2002 GMT there is a vote on the first version of point five. Result: 544 in favor; 271 against; 30 abstentions. Prolonged applause.

At 2003 GMT Yeltsin says he understands their emotional outbursts, but the presidium must remain impartial. Although because everyone has voted by name you know very well how I voted. Even though the first version has been passed, the second version must still be voted on. Please vote now, he asks. The result: 256 in favor; 529 against; 54 abstentions. Thus only the first version stands. But now we need to vote on the amendments to point five. First though there will be a break for 30 minutes.

At 2006 GMT correspondents interview individual deputies in the foyer during the break.

Agricultural Report Given

LD0806225590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2007 GMT on 8 June continues its recorded relay from the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin on 8 June. Correspondents are interviewing deputies in the foyer during the break in the session. First to be interviewed is Deputy Blokhin. Then B.I. Lysenko, an army officer, comments on the debate preceding the vote. Deputy Morozov complains of slowness of work of the congress in the election of officials. Yegorov of the Democratic Russia bloc speaks of the blocking of progressive ideas. Burbulis from Sverdlovsk wants full composition of the Supreme Soviet. Ivanov complains of small numbers in the parliament. Zemina from Bryansk says she is sorry to be away from her normal duties on the farm but she will stay in Moscow as long as she is needed.

At 2017 GMT the evening session continues. Yeltsin says amendments must be tabled in writing. The declaration is to be adopted on Wednesday. Yeltsin tells deputies to take their places. The tellers' commission was not prepared for 20 alternative persons. The Supreme Soviet is to meet tomorrow but it still has to be elected. Deputies make suggestions. Yeltsin suggests working till 1800 hours local time and then working two hours tomorrow. One suggests starting at 0900 which Yeltsin approves. A deputy says there will not be a quorum tomorrow. Another says many will go away for the weekend. Yeltsin says that to go away now without having elected a Supreme Soviet would be inconvenient. He suggests voting for working till six tonight and going in at nine tomorrow morning. This is adopted.

At 2030 GMT Nazarchuk of the agrarian deputies' group asks for 30 minutes to report on agriculture. He tells of the critical state of agriculture; lack of food; low productivity of agriculture; low quality; waste of produce during harvest; neglect of peasants' interests; low living conditions of peasants. One home in five has no running water. Two thirds of villages lack schools. There is a lack of drinking water. Flight of peasants from the land—ten villages disappear every day. The food problem cannot be solved without stopping this flight. In a few years' time it will be too late. In other countries the farmer is highly esteemed. Not so in our country. He speaks of billions of debt to the Russian countryside and the need to strengthen the material and technical basis. The peasant in Russia does not work worse than abroad but he has less wherewithal to work, and outdated machinery on farms. Conversion has not yet had any effect. He calls for end to monopoly of farm machinery manufacture, incentives for these manufacturers. He discusses the question of finance and self financing, the state of the food processing industry, upkeep of roads, the need for funds for remote areas, and the need for consumer facilities in these areas, the transition to market economy will require new insurance facilities for crops etc. We want this transition to go smoothly. We support Yeltsin's idea that Russia should have its own concept of transition to market, step-by-step. More investment in rural areas is needed; also tax concessions for the agroindustrial complex. More responsibility for deliveries to the rural areas. A special state program of support is needed.

At 2055 questions are asked. Belov asks what is priority, capital injection or change in relations in countryside? Nazarchuk replies. Another talks about various points on the draft resolution. Nazarchuk says questions were meant to be about the report; we will discuss the resolution later. A woman asks a question about fish farms. Shishkin criticizes the conception which he says is the same they have had for the past 70 years. Nazarchuk answers a question about the one ministry responsible for farm machinery manufacture. We want farm machine manufacture handed over to the republic. Nazarchuk speaks of farms which suffered from drought in Altay. Deputy Ivanov warns of dark consequences if Russia's agriculture is not sorted out in three years. Production relations must be changed along with capital investment.

A 2105 Yeltsin wants questions and then voting. A deputy says it's not a question of production relations but of production forces. Another says in the past ten years we have poured billions into agriculture to no effect. How will it work better now? Nazarchuk says that all those years billions were lifted from the rural areas.

At 2110 GMT in reply to a question Nazarchuk says the peasant has been exploited and virtually worked for nothing.

More on Report

LD0806231790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2115 GMT on 8 June continues its recorded relay of proceedings at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin on 8 June. Questions continue to Nazarchuk on peasant property and the food processing monopoly. Yeltsin suggests finishing and answering two written questions. One question is on giving land to peasants. Nazarchuk suggests real cooperative farms. Yeltsin asks for a vote on whether to end the debate, saying there is an alternative conception.

At 2122 GMT Altukhov presents an alternative conception: it is about economic relations in agriculture, with pluralism in organization of farms, right of inheritance of property, and the right to hire labor. Deputy Tarasov in military uniform speaks of a looming disaster.

At 2135 GMT Yeltsin says Altukhov's concept cannot be adopted now. The Council of Ministers can be asked to work up a resolution on the basis of the concept and present it some time in the course of the year. A vote is taken on a resoltion to this effect: passed: 677 for, 60 against, and 29 abstentions.

At 2140 GMT Yeltsin notes the proposal to express condolences on the disaster in Novokuznetsk mine. He reads out the condolences expressing solidarity. A show of hands approves the telegram from the congress. He then mentions the decree on power on Wednesday. On the situation on Moscow shopping, he says a government official will deal with the Moscow-provinces question. Replying to a written question on whether he has had a meeting with the president, Yeltsin says consultations with his aide and the president's aide are being held on this. The meeting will take place next week, he says. On the anniversary of the Karelia labor commune, he expresses congratulations on this.

At 2145 GMT Grachev speaks about deputies' questions, and lists questions.

At 2150 GMT Rasskasov holds up a list of communists being prevented from getting into the Supreme Soviet.

At 2157 GMT Yeltsin says investigations should be made and then a report made to the congress.

At 2159 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks of alternative ideas on the economy.

At 2202 GMT Yeltsin says his program will be revealed by the candidate to the post of chairman of Council of Ministers of RSFSR.

At 2203 GMT the session closes. It is to resume at 0900 on 9 June, Moscow time.

At 2204 there are further interviews with deputies in the lobby. One speaks of the market and the need for resources. Druganov speaks on the question not of ethnic minorities, but of the majority and their protection. Chaykovskiy of the KGB speaks of the need to prevent the disintegration of Russia, of the question of voting. The relay concludes.

Yeltsin Gets Congress Backing For TV Address

LD0806184490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1552 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Remarks by Boris Yeltsin at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin on 8 June—recorded]

[Excerpts] Regarding my television address, which would be a sort of address to the Russians and the peoples of the Russian Federation—I think that there is indeed a very difficult situation at the moment throughout the country and in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], of course. It is explosive. And one ought no doubt to give an address and simply speak to television viewers and the people of the RSFSR, so that they appreciate that a new corps of deputies has come in, that a new Supreme Soviet leadership has come in, and that a new government is coming in. There should be an appeal for no actions that could destabilize the situation to be taken at this time and that we should be given a certain period of grace for a couple of years. And we are saying that in a couple of years we shall first see the situation beginning to stabilize, and in the third year people's living standards beginning to improve somewhat. And this period of grace should be given to the new leadesrhip, and then we shall all start to pull together. I think that you will support the idea of specially considering the agrarian question, the food question—one of the most important issues—at an extraordinary congress. [applause] I think that Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting] and Comrade Nenashev, and also those in the leadership of the country who look after television, will give me the right to speak on television and address the citizens of Russia. [applause] [passage omitted]

[Unidentified deputy] Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich. I refer to your address to the Russians. I believe that we should today put this in the form of an instruction to you from the congress and take a vote on it, so that we don't create a situation whereby some member of the politburo who looks after television ends up deciding whether to allow you to speak or not. It must be a congress decision! [applause]

[Yeltsin] Given that such things have happened to me before, I think that this would constitute a fine, strong expression of support. Who supports an instruction to People's Deputy Yeltsin to speak on television and address the citizens of Russia? Let's have a show of hands. Who supports it? [Deputies raise hands in support] It's quite clear.

Gorbachev Chairs Joint Russian Party Meeting

LD0906213690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] A joint session of the Russian Bureau of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee and the prepararatory committee of the Russian party conference was held today under the chairmanship of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the chairman of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, to consider main questions of the work of the forthcoming forum of the communists of the republic.

"The forthcoming party congress will be a turning point, because it must consolidate everything that has been gained with such difficulty and not only by the party but by the whole of society as well as to asssess the experience of the five years of perestroyka in order to make serious generalizations and forecast the immediate prospects for the party's activities in new conditions," Gorbachev said in his remarks at the session.

"The Russian party conference acquires special importance in pre- congress activities of the CPSU," he emphasized. "The creation of a Communist Party of the Russian Federation will be one of major subjects delegates to the conference will consider.

"There should be no delay in founding a Communist Party of the Russian Federation in the light of the existing situation and social expectations.

"At the same time one should act in a well thought-out way so that this step would not make for the development of centrifugal trends but would be aimed at consolidating the CPSU and the whole of society," Gorbachev said.

Touching on specific issues of the holding of the Russian party conference, Comrade Gorbachev noted that various proposals have been put forward on this. One of them contemplates the adoption of a resolution on the formation of a Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, the election of a first secretary, and the forming of an organizational committee at the first stage, in order to convene a constituent congress in the autumn. Another proposal is to constitute the conference as a constituent congress, and elect the leading organs of the Communist Party at it. These issues became the subject of a lively discussion by the participants of the sitting. It was decided to take into account the broad spectrum of opinions, proposals, and remarks in the course of future preparatory work, and to put them forward for the inspection of a council of representatives from delegations.

The majority of members of the preparatory committee advocated that the Russian Party conference itself constitutes the constituent congress of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party. Moreover, it was emphasized that the final decision on this issue would be adopted by the conference itself.

During the discussion, in view of the importance of the creation of a Communist Party of the Russian Federation, members of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the preparatory committee deemed it advisable to recommend that Gorbachev deliver a report at the conference.

More on Preparations

LD0906215390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1903 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Moscow, 9 Jun (TASS)—[passage omitted] During the discussion, the members of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the preparatory committee, taking into account the significance of the matter of creating a Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, deemed it expedient to recommend M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU and chairman of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, as the keynote speaker at the conference.

G.I. Usmanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made a report at the session on the procedural issues of holding the party conference. His speech touched upon matters of the agenda, the formation of the leading bodies, the order of work and the standing orders of the conference, holding a council of delegation representatives, and of situating the participants in the Russian party conference in the main hall at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

The preparatory committee has been instructed to complete work on the proposals on the leading bodies, the order of work, the standing orders, and on the draft documents of the conference, taking into account the exchange of views that has been held, and to submit them to a meeting of the delegation representatives which is scheduled to be held in Moscow on 16 June.

Taking into account that workers and peasants have insufficient representation among the delegates, it has been recognized expedient to invite 200 Communists who are representatives of the working class and peasantry to the conference.

It is recommended that the decisions on this are made at plenums or expanded sittings of the bureaus of the kray and oblast party committees. It was also decided to invite representatives of the communist parties of all the republics to the conference as its guests.

Taking part in the work of the joint sitting of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the preparatory committee of the Russian Party organization were members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee V.I. Vorotnikov, L.N.. Zaykov, V.A. Medvedev, N.N. Slyunkov, candidate members of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee A.A. Vlasov, B.K. Pugo, G.P. Razumovskiy, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee O.O. Baklanov and I.T. Frolov, and heads of departments of the CPSU Central Committee.

Shabanov Elected Voronezh Oblast First Secretary

LD0706090490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] The Voronezh Oblast Party Conference will conclude its work today. There was a change in the party's leader yesterday. Ivan Mikhaylovich Shabanov, who previously worked as deputy chairman of the oblast executive committee, was elected first secretary of the obkom [oblast committee] of the CPSU on a multicandidate basis.

Caucasus

Attacks on Army Increasing in Transcaucasus

LD1106080990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0710 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 11 Jun (TASS)—In the first five months of this year alone more than 250 sub-machine guns and thousands of bullets for them have been stolen from units of the Transcaucasus military district. This was reported by Lieutenant General Vyacheslav Yermin, head of a Directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces. Today he gave a TASS correspondent an interview in connection with the increasingly frequent attacks by extremists in the Transcaucasus on individual soldiers and even on military units with the aim of seizing weapons.

General Yermin gave examples of such instances. Thus, at 0500 on 24 April, in the settlement of Uzhenis, Kafanskiy rayon, Armenia, an attack on a motorized infantry platoon post, reinforced by an infantry combat vehicle, was carried out by a group of extremists of Armenian nationality armed with hunting weapons and pistols. The sentry, standing at the entrance to the barracks was stunned by a blow to the head and disarmed. Blocking the exit of the building, the extremists opened the combat vehicle and took 11 sub-machine guns, 41 magazines with ammunition for them, 11 bayonets, and three hand-grenades, and escaped in a vehicle without license plates.

As General Yermin noted, attacks on sentries guarding weapons stores have also become more frequent. Thus, late at night on 3 June near Tbilisi extremists of Georgian nationality opened fire with rifles on a sentry in order to get onto amilitary base. The sentry, Boris Ponomarenko, returned fire and wounded one of the extremists. The attackers escaped, leaving behind the wounded man who, as was established later, was a certain Geridze. The sentry Ponomarenko has been recommended for a government decoration.

In General Yermin's opinion, extremists in the Transcaucasus now have thousands of various small arms, which is fraught with unpredictable results for clashes on interethnic grounds.

Vyacheslav Yermin noted that the situation is made more complicated by the circumstance that the local authorities are doing practically nothing and are not undertaking any measures in order to disarm the extremist formations.

Troops Ask Supreme Soviet for Armenia Action

PM0806213990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Appeal Adopted"]

[Text] Meetings have been held in the military collectives of units of the Soviet Army and internal and border troops deployed on the territory of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. They adopted an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet. It says in part:

In January 1990 we were instructed by the Soviet Government to ensure the security of the inhabitants of Armenia in population centers near the border with the Azerbaijan SSR. When the subunits of the Soviet Army and internal troops arrived in these villages they found armed groups of local inhabitants installed in many of them. Most of them voluntarily ceded their positions, entrusting the maintenance of public order and security to the military.

From the very beginning complete mutual understanding and close relations were established between the servicemen and the local population. People welcomed us cordially, and shared their last crust with us. Yes, their last crust, because Armenia had been blockaded, and there was not enough food, especially food subject to restricted distribution. However, they tried to ensure that we lacked nothing, that we lived as well as we had ever done; they shared their last crust. How can we forget that? But at the same time, at rallies in Yerevan extremist appeals were ringing out which were designed to undermine the people's faith in the Army, to drive a wedge between us.

...At present the extremists are slinging mud at us, trying to discredit us in they eyes of the people, to provoke clashes, and they have recently started committing acts of terrorism. What are they gambling on? On our tolerance and restraint, on the fact that we are indeed restricted in what we can do, and that we have no intention of shooting at the people. They are gambling on impunity and connivance. Suffice it to say that no action has been taken as a result of the terrorists' criminal actions against servicemen. Power has been practically paralyzed.

...We are appealing to you with a request to make a political assessment of the events in Armenia and to do everything possible to stabilize the situation in this area where blood is being spilled.

Thatcher Arrives in Leninakhan 10 Jun

Thousands Mob Thatcher

LD1006121790 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1114 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Thousands of Armenians today gave Mrs Thatcher such a tumultuous and rapturous reception when she arrived in the earthquake devastated city of Leninakhan that her security men feared for her life.

The greeting as virtually the whole 108,000 population turned out to see her was so overwhelming and potentially dangerous that police ordered her to change her route-disappointing hundreds of flag-waving children.

The security men were also worried about hostility within the crowd as police got rough with some of their womenfolk.

In temperatures soaring towards the 90's the citizens lined the streets, swarmed up the trees and even balanced precariously on roofs.

They hung out of windows, climbed up lamp-posts and cheered and screamed when she arrived to open the 4 million pound Lord Byron School built as a gift by Britain to replace one destroyed in the earthquake in December 1988 which killed 16,000 people in the city alone.

Police decided that the crowds were so dense that it was impossible for her to enter the school from the front without endangering her life.

She was whisked round the back as police and other men formed a chain of linked arms to allow her car to edge through the milling throng.

Her husband Denis and Mr. Kenneth Baker, who was education secretary at the time, and other officials, had to leave their cars and struggle through the crowds for more than 500 yards.

Mr. Baker said: "We had to fight our way through. But it was very good natured - just a mass of humanity with people losing their shoes, their glasses and stumbling over."

Outside those children who got to see her flung posies of red orange and white carnations at her. They shouted: "We love you." And one banner said: "You are the most beautiful and famous prime minister in the world."

But other banners waved by onlookers said: "Gorbachev is a tyrant" and "Red Army out".

Inside Mrs Thatcher saw a portrait of herself painted by a 10-year-old boy. She said: "I am delighted. It is nice to think that people see you as being so young."

Mrs. Thatcher remained cool throughout the tumult. The crowds outside banged on the windows of the school when they saw her inside, but there was no serious trouble. She said: "It was a fantastic reception. I saw a lot of the devastation."

Only 300 of the city's 1,040 buildings remained intact after the earthquake. A total of 25,000 people throughout Armenia were killed.

The school will take 400 people aged six to 16 and concentrate on teaching English.

Yerevan Reports Visit

NC1106133690 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Report by Mavr Danielyan on British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's visit to Leninakan, Armenia, on 10 June—recorded]

[Excerpts] After the earthquake, a large number of visitors came to Leninakan from all parts of our country and from many other countries to rescue, treat, and succor the victims and create bearable living conditions for them. Everything has been and is being done to revive Leninakan, the main city of Shirakskiy rayon.

For the people of Leninakan, 10 June was a significant day, for British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was their guest. The streets of Leninakan were full of people from the early morning. The crowd of people extended all the way from the airport to the newly built Byron School; they were holding flowers, flags, and placards. [passage omitted]

After the ceremony at Byron School, the visitors toured the city, conversed with the workers, and placed a wreath on one of the monuments erected in memory of the victims of the earthquake. Prime Minister Thatcher and those accompanying her left Leninakan today.

Azerbaijan Party Congress Opens 8 Jun

Agenda Viewed

NC0806194890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Committed and enterprising communists, who cherish a serious sense of responsibility toward the future of the restructuring course and the revolutionary restructuring of society, have been elected by the republic's party organizations as delegates to the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress, which opened in Lenin's Palace on 8 June. In keeping with tradition, the delegates laid bouquets of roses at Lenin's statue in Lenin Square before the congress was opened by Ayaz Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee. The delegates observed a moment of silence in memory of those who were killed in the interethnic incidents.

The members of the leading organs of the congress—that is, the chairmanship council, the secretariat, and the (?auditing) and credentials committees—were elected. The agenda and work schedule of the congress was established as follows:

1. The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee's accounting report on the progress of the restructuring course and the tasks of the republic's party organizations.

2. The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Auditing Commission's report.

3. The CPSU Central Committee draft platform for [word indistinct] and democratic socialism, which will be presented to the 28th CPSU Congress.

4. The CPSU draft constitution.

5. The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee draft platform for the republic's genuine sovereignty and the restructuring of the Azerbaijan Communist Party in the new federation, which has been drawn up for the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress.

6. The election of members of the leading organs of the Azerbaijan Communist Party.

7. The election of deputies to the 28th CPSU Congress.

Ayaz Mutalibov read the political accounting report of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee on the progress of the restructuring course and the tasks of the republic's party organizations. Mamed Kaziyev, chairman of the auditing commission, read the commission's accounting report. Delegates then heard the report by the credentials committee, which was read by Mamedov, chairman of the committee. After a recess, the congress resumed its work on the following topics:

1. Matters concerning organizational party work and cadre policy. Speaker: Viktor Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

2. The party's current social and economic policy. Speaker: Fuad Musayev, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

3. Problems in the party's current agricultural policy. Speaker: Tel'man Orudzhev, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

4. Matters related to improving ideological work. Speaker: Ratib Zeynalov, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

5. The advancement of the establishment of a national state and the creation of harmony in interethnic relations. Speaker: Afrand Dashdamirov, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

The congress will continue its work on 9 June.

Mutalibov Defends Leading Role

LD0906204890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] [Announcer] Today the 32nd Congress of the Azerbaijan Communist Party began work in Baku. Islam Kuliyev, our correspondent, reports.

[Kuliyev] The communists of Azerbaijan have convened their forum in a complex socio-political situation. Very many complex issues and urgent problems have accumulated over the last few years in the lives and work of the republic's population. The political and economic crisis, the exacerbated inter-ethnic relations that have been brought about by the artificial problem of Nagorno-Karabakh, and the tense situation on the border with a neighboring republic are all hampering normal life and the progress of perestroyka. It is no secret that over this period the authority of the party has been shaken too.

How to get this authority back, improve the economy, achieve, while remaining within the CPSU, independence in the adoption of decisions and strengthen the sovereign rights of Azerbaijan within a federation of Soviet republic that is being revitalized—all these questions were given a principled assessment in the report of the Central Committee delivered by Ayaz Niyazovich Mutalibov, first secretary of the republican party organization and president of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

[Begin Mutalibov recording] The restructuring process in Azerbaijan is proceeding in an extremely contradictory way. The causes and character of the slow-down and political zigzags which have led to a grave crisis in the republic and the Communist Party and the splitting up of ethnic forces were analyzed at a plenum of the communist party of Azerbaijan Central Committee in March 1990. The 32nd congress must develop the conclusions and re-interpret much of what has been experienced. These events must also, of course, be considered in the context of all the events that are taking place in our country.

The events of the past few years, the inter-ethnic hostility caused by the conflict in the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] which has given rise to the problem of refugees, and the political and recently armed confrontation of a neighboring republic with Azerbaijan have made a profound imprint on all our life. Never before throughout the years of Soviet rule has the Azerbaijani people suffered such severe upheavals. Because of this, the 32nd communist party congress has the importance of an extraordinary and emergency congress. This is not just because the period in office of the Central Committee, as laid down by the rulers, has not yet elapsed. The emergency character of the congress is also determined by the fact that the situation in the republic, as throughout the whole country, has reached a kind of critical mass, the point where it is decided whether or not perestroyka continues to exist and how the historical destiny of the people and the destiny of the communist party of Azerbaijan will develop.

The most dynamic and fruitful stage in the history of Azerbaijan, during which it became a highly developed republic with a powerful economic and intellectual potential, was traversed under the leadership of the Communist Party. This is an incontenstable fact. The Communist Party as the leading structure and political force has firmly entered the historical awareness of the people. This is also a fact which is not only impossible but even dangerous to ignore. If one were to imagine the Communist Party voluntarily leaving the political arena, a vacuum would be formed that could not be filled by any of the public organizations that have arisen on the wave of perestroyka. [end recording]

[Announcer] The congress of Azerbaijan's Communists will continues its work tomorrow.

Congress Continues 9 Jun

NC0906194890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress continued its work today. Debates were held on the reports presented to the congress by Ayaz Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and Mamed Kaziyev, chairman of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Auditing Commission. [passage omitted]

Debates about the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee accounting reports then ended and were summed up by Ayaz Mutalibov.

The congress approved the work carried out by the central committee during the accounting period. Committees were established to deliberate over the Congress' resolution and on the requests and complaints conveyed to the congress.

The congress elected the members of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and the Auditing Commission as delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. Thirteen delegates were nominated as delegates to the various organs of the CPSU Central Committee. Meanwhile, the congress adopted decisions related to the CPSU Central Committee's draft platform for the 28th CPSU Congress and to CPSU rules and regulations. The party committees were asked to continue their work to publicize and explain these documents.

The congress also adopted a decision in connection with the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee's draft platform for the 32d congress. An editorial committee was established to continue work on this document. The editorial committee will brief the 32d congress on the additions and proposals that will be included in the draft platform.

The congress unanimously adopted a resolution in connection with the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. Later, a decision was adopted to end the work of the congress, which will resume work after the 28th CPSU Congress.

Mutalibov Reelected Party Chief

LD0906215590 Moscow TASS in English 2055 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Natan Barsky]

[Text] Baku June 10 TASS—Speakers at the 32nd congress of the Azerbaijan Communist Party, which continued its work on Saturday, said that the main direction in the activities of the Azerbaijan Communist Party at the present stage is to develop the national statehood of the Azerbaijani people and to ensure the sovereignty, political and economic independence and territorial integrity of this Transcaucasian Soviet republic.

The congress discussed a political report of the party's Central Committee "on the course of perestroyka and the tasks of the republic's party organisations" delivered by party chief Ayaz Mutalibov.

Speakers during two-day discussions emphasised that the strengthening of sovereignty should not be to the detriment of the interests of the renewing federation or of the common Soviet home. Therefore many delegates believe that it is essential to conclude a new treaty of the federation, which should clearly define the status of the union republics as sovereign states and the powers of the Union.

The congress positively assessed measures being taken by the leadership of the republican party organisation to stabilise the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh. The congress elected delegates to the 28th CPSU's Congress.

Ayaz Mutalibov was re-elected the first secretary of the party's Central Committee. The Azerbaijan Communists' congress will resume its work after the CPSU congress.

Congress Concludes 9 Jun

LD0906205490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" Newscast]

[Excerpt] The 32nd Congress of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan broke off today after deciding to resume work after the 28th CPSU Congress.

[Correspondent M. Mamedov, identified by screen caption] The delegates today continued debate on the review report. They also put forward their proposals on the draft platform of the CPSU Central Comnmittee for the 28th party congress and the on the CPSU rules. Note was made of the need for organizational and ideological unity of the entire party. While giving overall support to the principle of introducing market relations in the country, the congress noted that hasty ill-considered steps must not be permitted, especially when raising the price of bread. After the debate, the delegates began forming the leading party bodies of the republic and electing delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. [passage omitted]

Azerbaijan Popular Front Calls for Cooperation

NC1106103790 Istanbul TERCUMAN in Turkish 7 Jun 90 p 6

[Text] Moscow (AA)—The Popular Front of Azerbaijan has appealed to all democratic people and organizations in the Caucasus to forget the interethnic clashes and tensions and cooperate to establish "the joint house of the Caucasus."

Explaining the appeal to ANATOLIA, Yusuf Sametov, member of the executive council of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan, said that the appeal is intended to make the people in the Caucasus region realize that they can acquire economic strength and deal with Moscow only through unity. Noting that the appeal "was a step toward resolving problems through dialogue and not through the use of force," Sametov said: "Moscow can crush us like flies if we continue to act separately. However, we can withstand Moscow's pressure if we act together."

Sametov asserted that the appeal urged cooperation among all democratic forces in Armenia, the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic, and Dagestan. He also revealed that work has begun to establish a new party which will be called the "Democratic Party of Northern Azerbaijan."

Noting that important members of the Popular Front, such as Isay Kamberov, Khikmat Gadzhizade, Tofik Kasumov, and Penah Guseynov, are on the seven-member founding committee he chairs, Sametov said that the new party's program and rules are being drawn up. The two documents will be approved when the new party holds its founding congress in a few months.

Tense Situation in Kazakhskiy Rayon Reported

NC0806105590 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] AZERINFORM's special correspondent has reported that a tense situation has been created in the Kazakhskiy Rayon towns which border the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic. The tense situation was caused by the actions of bandits of the inauspicious Armenian national army to intensify their aggressive activities. For example, armed men have opened fire on the towns of Sofulu, Kemerli, and Barkhudarly over the past few days. Bayramov, deputy chief of the Kazakhskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department, has said that the rayon's militia units captured [words indistinct] during their operations. It has been established that they were prepared [words indistinct] and were to be taken to the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. [passage indistinct]

Interethnic Situation Stabilized in Azerbaijan

NC0806110990 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] In a disclosure on the operational situation in the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the Azerbaijan SSR Internal Affairs Ministry has said that the interethnic situation has noticeably stabilized.

Individual negative developments that occurred last week have not effected the gradually strengthening positive developments.

The newspapers have reported that criminal cases recorded last week were only 20 percent of those recorded in the past. However, serious crimes continue to be committed. Detailed information has been provided in the ministry's report published in today's newspapers.

Attack on Azeri Village Reported

PM1106090590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[V. Korsh AZERINFORM-TASS dispatch: "Where Does Violence Lead?"]

[Text] Reports not of the construction of housing and not of the progress of agricultural work but of movements of combat equipment belonging to no one knows who and of armed men over the rayon's territory have been regularly reaching the Kazakhskiy party raykom [rayon committee] in recent months. This rayon of Azerbaijan bordering on Armenia has become the target for constant attacks by Armenian thugs. Only one thing can explain their purposeful attacks—the desire to drive the Azerbaijanis out of this part of the republic.

Unfortunately, in many respects the bandits are succeeding in attaining their aims. The inhabitants of the majority of border villages have been obliged to hurriedly evacuate to the interior of the republic, swelling the army of nearly 200,000 Azerbaijani refugees. Indeed, what could they do but flee? After all, many people in the rayon can remember the tragedy of Baganis-Ayrym village. According to official reports this village was fired on and then burned down and looted by Armenian thugs. But the anguish and anger of the village inhabitants who miraculously escaped unscathed cannot be contained within the dry lines of reports.

"They fired on our homes all night from hail guns," says Nasib Dashdamirov, one of those who survived the horror of the attack. "And at 0600 hours the thugs broke into the village. The two village militiamen, armed with pistols, tried to stop the attack and give people a chance to get away, but how? The thugs fired from automatic weapons and operated precisely and in coordination. Few people managed to escape from the village. And later, when we came back after the bandits had left, we saw something which cannot be described. they had killed 11 people, five of them from Dadash Asliyev's family, who had been burned in the barn. They had shot a child with a submachinegun. They had burned Almamed Magerramov and a seven-year-old girl, Aliya, in a hayrick. And then they set fire to the village, after looting the houses and driving the livestock in the direction of Armenia."

Having completed its foul deed the subunit created allegedly for "the defense of the Armenian borders" against who knows what enemy retreated home without losses.

The Azerbaijan people will have to suffer the tragedy of this village, which has been called the Azerbaijani Khatyn, just as they have the tragedy of the dozens of destroyed and looted villages in the border regions. But people want to know why the heavily armed thugs are tolerated. On whose orders are the terrorists arrested in Azerbaijan being set free and why are they not being handed over to the organs of the prosecutor's office of the republic whose laws they are violating?

It is obviously no simple matter to answer these questions. But everyone who is delaying the solution of the question of the disarmament of the gangs and formations operating on the border with Azerbaijan should remember the simple truth that violence breeds violence.

Abovyanskiy Rayon Committee Official Replaced

NC0906091990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] The Abovyanskiy rayon party committee plenum met and discussed an organizational issue. The plenum relieved Zargaryan of his duties as first secretary of the rayon party committee (?at his own request). After a secret ballot, the plenum elected Ovanesyan as first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Abovyanskiy rayon committee. He previously worked as chairman of the executive committee of the Abovyanskiy rayon's soviet of people's deputies.

The plenum was attended by Oleg Lobov, second secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, and Mkrtichyan, member of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and head of the administration for organizational, party, and cadre activities.

Central Asia

Kirghiz Residents Begin Day of Mourning

LD1106053890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0520 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Frunze, 11 June (TASS)—A day of mourning has been proclaimed today in Soviet Kirghizia. Banners are at half-mast and places of entertainment are closed. Last week bloody clashes between Kirghiz and Uzbeks living in Osh Oblast claimed 116 lives, with 468 people wounded and some 500 cases of arson.

The Ministry of Internal affairs of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic reports there are now signs of a tendency for the situation in the south of the republic to stabilize. In Osh, the industrial and trading silk-production association, one of the biggest in the oblast, is back at work; shops are opening and the operation of transport is being organized. In the city and the rayons meetings of "aksakals" and respected persons of all nationalities living in the oblast are being held. Those assembled are discussing ways of solving the crisis and clearing complex social problems.

In the republic's capital, Frunze, the situation has remained calm since the state of emergency was declared on 7 June.

Kirghiz Blockade Threatens Fuel Reserves

LD1106133190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1244 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Nina Merezhnikov]

[Text] Dushanbe, 11 Jun (TASS)—Diesel-fired electric power stations on the territory of the Soviet Pamir (autonomous part of Tajikistan) are threatened by a full stoppage: there remains only enough fuel reserves here for two to three days. The critical situation has been caused by a blockade of the Pamir highway—the road along which the bulk of industrial and food freight arrives at the "roof of the world".

The mountain-dwellers of the Soviet Pamir are linked with the valley inhabitants by two vehicular routes. One of them leads to Khorog, the center of the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast, from Dushanbe, the capital of Tajikistan. The road is operational for only several months each year, when the passes above cloud level are freed from snow. The other all-year route runs to Khorog through the Kirghiz town of Osh. In Osh there is a major vehicular transportation enterprise, whose drivers forward freight to the Pamir. Many of them have been subject to attacks in the past week by Kirghiz extremists, participants in the notorious tragic events in Osh.

According to Aleksandr Vasiliyev, the Tajik deputy minister of motor transport, "stones were thrown at the cabs of passing trucks along the 200 km Kirghiz stretch of the road. Often shots are heard, too. In some cases groups of assailants have stopped trucks, dragging out the drivers, and beaten them up."

According to the deputy minister, there is still no precise information about the number of drivers who have suffered. Many drivers managed to hide from their pursuers in remote gorges. But some have vanished without trace. Efforts are being made to identify them.

The Government of Soviet Tajikistan has taken steps to increase the flow of goods along the Dushanbe-Khorog road. Additional vehicles have been allocated for this purpose. Attempts have also been made to break the blockade from the Kirghiz side. A convoy of trucks has left Osh for Khorog with a paramilitary escort.

TASS Reports Situation in Osh 'Stabilized'

LD1106133490 Moscow TASS in English 1323 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Frunze June 11 TASS—The military commander of the Kirghiz capital, Frunze, Colonel Felix Kulov, secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee Medet Sherimkulov and militia officers gave a press conference here today.

They spoke about the situation in the republic and the authorities' measures to normalise it.

The Presidium of the Kirghiz Supreme Soviet imposed a state of emergency in Frunze last Thursday to ensure people's safety against the growing unrest among young people and the sharp deterioration of the situation in the city due to militant actions.

The disorders originated in Kirghizia's Osh region last Monday after a dispute between Uzbeks and Kirghiz over the allocation of land for housing construction.

The clashes have claimed more than 100 lives over the week. About 500 people have been injured. Houses, state-run enterprises and cars were burnt.

The situation in Osh region has started to stabilise. A number of industrial enterprises, shops and transport have started to operate.

Presidential Council member Kirghiz author Chinghiz Aytmatov and Uzbek writers Adyl Yakubov and Perimkul Kadyrov, who arrived in Osh, went on local television to address the local population.

The situation in Frunze remains calm. On Sunday, an attempt to hold an unsanctioned rally on a downtown square was thwarted. Most citizens met with understanding the military commander's televised appeal to stay away from the rally.

Kirghiz Minister Says Situation Improving

LD1106123190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] [Announcer] On the events in Kirghizia. You are all aware of the unfortunate events that have taken place in Osh Oblast and of the strained and tense situation that has developed there. No doubt, you have already heard than an emergency situation has been introduced in the oblast. In order to give you more precise information, we have asked our correspondent, Aleksandr Mirtov, to interview the commandant of Osh oblast, Kirghizia's Minister of Internal Affairs Major General Goncharov. Here is that interview:

[Begin recording] [Goncharov] I would like to say that the situation here is now becoming more normal. We are effectively in control of the operational situation but tension remains, nevertheless. All the forces and means we have today will enable us to normalize the situation within the next few days. The attention being shown today by party and local soviet authorities, the presence of our writer Chingiz Aytmatov, a member of the Presidential Council, and that of writers from fraternal Uzbekistan, will help to normalize the situation in the region.

If (?we were) to say today what responsibility there could be, whether we are [word indistinct] I have to say with all confidence that the process is becoming more normal. Those guilty will be brought to book. We have a large investigative and operational group at work in the republic at the moment, headed by representatives of the USSR Procuracy, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the USSR KGB with the operational and investigative staff of the republic providing assistance.

[Mirtov] Viktor Vasiliyevich, is it possible to say at present whether specific forces were behind the extremist elements?

[Goncharov] That can only be answered definitively once we have the results of the work of the investigative and operational group. As I have already said, that work is in hand.

[Mirtov] With what weapons were extremists armed?

[Goncharov] If we are talking about, say, Uzgenskiy rayon, there were rifle and pistol rounds there in the hands of the extremists. If we are talking about other rayons, for example, Karasu, these were present, as they were in Frunze. We have tried to do everything to avoid using firearms. If they have been used it has been as an extreme measure, to protect people, as a rule and to protect militia staff themselves. [end recording]

[Announcer] A resolution of the Central Committee of the Kirghiz Communist Party, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and the republican Council of Ministers has declared Monday, 11 June a day of mourning. Throughout the republic's territory, state flags are to be lowered, entertainment and other mass ventures cancelled, and the necessary changes made to the programs of republican radio and television.

Uzbek, Kirghiz Leaders View 'Tragic Events'

LD1106124890 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 0115 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] On 9 June in Osh, there was a meeting between the chairmen of the councils of ministers of two Union republics, Uzbekistan and Kirghizia—Mirsaidov and Dzhumagulov—with the participation of Khalmirzayev and Sydykov, respectively first secretaries of Andizhan and Osh Party Oblast Committees. They discussed matters connected with the tragic events in Osh oblast of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and worked out measures to ensure the safety of the population. Mirsaidov reported on measures being taken by the republic's leadership to stabilize the situation; in particular, he reported that among the population living in the Uzbek SSR there are no casualties. At the same time he expressed concern for the fate of the Uzbek population of Osh oblast, and demanded that their safety be ensured.

Also discussed were questions of improving medical care for the victims. Help from medical staff was offered. Having expressed the alarm of the population of Andizhan, Fergana and Namangan oblasts, Mirsaidov paid special attention to the need for ensuring the safety of stock-breeders and bee-keepers in mountain areas and also residents of the cities of Osh, Uzgen, Kara-Su, and Aravan.

Dzhumagulov reported on work done over the past few days by party, local soviet and law-enforcement bodies, and sub-units of the Soviet Army and internal troops to ensure the safety of residents of Osh oblast. Considering the situation that has come about, he (?was going around) meeting the population, and on behalf of the government and Kirghiz people, apologized for the actions of the criminal elements.

The meeting ended by working out joint specific measures on the problems under discussion aimed at further normalization of the position, further elimination of the [word indistinct] conflicts, and stabilization of the overall situation in the region.

On 9 June internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and sub-units of militia continued their efforts to normalize the situation in Osh oblast. On the whole tension tended to subside. However, the position still remains uneasy. In Uzgenskiy and Kara-suyskiy rayons, disorders continue. In Andizhan oblast leaders of party, local soviet and law-enforcement bodies, people's deputies and aksakals are holding meetings in educational establishments, at enterprises, organizations and farms and at the homes and workplaces of working people. Explanatory work is being carried out [words indistinct] on the consequences of holding unauthorized rallies in conditions of the state of emergency.a

Kirghiz Premier Accepts Blame, Outlines Plans

LD1006170290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Everyone is concerned about the situation in Kirghizia. We have received an interview with Apas Dzhumagulovich Dzhumagulov [chairman of the Kirghhiz Council of Ministers].

[Begin Dzhumagulov recording] The situation in Osh Oblast is fairly tense, although the tension compared to past days has eased. On the whole the situation is under control, including in the oblast center, in the town of Uzgen, and a number of other rayons where there were serious conflicts.

Unfortunately, we are to blame in many ways for the fact that for many years accumulating social problems were poorly or insufficiently effectively and energetically resolved. I think that this is where the main reason for what happened lies.

What are we undertaking? Much has been done. We are now in control of the situation. Today, we have involved in this work our elders, veterans, and respected people, not only of the oblast but of the republic as well. They are now among labor collectives, in collective and state farms, and with workers collectives, explaining the state of affairs, explaining what lies behind what has happened, the causes, and what measures are being taken. Already, fraternalization, in the full sense of the word, is underway in many rayons. We are contemplating involving, apart from elders, young people, young people who come from these rayons, writers, cultural and literary figures, and other comrades, in order, all together, as they say, to take the offensive against the evil that has happened.

Apart from this, representatives essentially of all republican ministries are here today, headed by Comrade Fisher, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, and they have already embarked upon repair work and are rendering immediate and essential assistance. By this I mean public buildings, because it is precisely public buildings that have been most severly damaged, especially in the town of Uzgen. In other towns, about 10 or 12 houses have either been burned down or are in serious condition and need repairs. They will be restored in a very short time. It will, or course, be more difficult to build new houses, but they too will be built at the republic's expense, at the oblast's expense. I think that by the fall all those comrades who have suffered misfortune will be living in their own homes. This is the first thing.

Second, medical aid is being given, and everything possible is being done to restore trade and daily services and restart transportation as quickly as possible. In a word, the city is gradually getting back into its normal routine. We are carrying out work to prevent this from happening again. We have met the leadership of the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the leadership of Andizhan Oblast and have addressed the issues which are causing a certain tension today. We must work. These peoples, who for centuries have lived together here on the territory of Kirghizia, must live as they did before, as brothers and sisters, working for the same goal. There are many problems. [end recording]

Troops 'Entirely' Control Uzgen in Kirghizia

LD1006165190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Video report by correspondent A. Guryanov in Osh Oblast of Kirghizia—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The tension is gradually subsiding. In Osh, the center of the oblast, transportation has begun operating and food shops have opened. Of no little importance in the East, the town market has opened. Tension is subsiding, but it is too soon to speak of a total normalization. [passage omitted]

We were informed at the MVD [Interior Ministry] press center that since the day of the events, 4 June, 115 people have died. Figures are updated every day, as you know; 468 people have been seriously injured. The situation in Uzgen appears uncertain as yet, 60 km from the oblast center. We have been told that this town is entirely under the control of units of the Soviet Army and of internal troops. Essential food was supplied today to the inhabitants of the town—that is several thousand people, of which the overwhelming majority are Uzbek. The victims of the conflict have been rendered medical aid. [video shows buses in streets, gathering of people celebrating a festival in the sunshine, scenes of the aftermath of the riots]

Kirghizia Death Toll Reaches 115

LD1006095490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0815 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Excerpt] [Announcer] We now again return to the events in Kirghizia on our Panorama program. Here is the latest news. Our correspondent in Frunze, Aleksandr Mirtov, is on the line to the Mayak studio, and he's going to tell us what the situation in the republic is today.

[Mirtov] Hello there, Moscow.

[Announcer] Hello.

[Mirtov] You know, the situation in the town here has been relatively calm since early morning, although there is a tense air of expectation. This has been caused by the fact that on 5, 6, and 7 June, unsanctioned student rallies took place in the republican capital, during and after which disorders, fights, and acts of hooliganism occurred in the city. A rally was also planned for today. But for the moment, as I have said, the city is calm. One can of course understand on a human level the alarm of young people over the tragic events in Osh oblast. After all, many of them come from there, and their friends and relatives live there. The further events developed, however, the clearer it became that the young people had ideological mentors who have been encouraging them. Agitators have been doing the rounds of the student hostels calling on students to go to rallies and threatening those who didn't want to. Witnesses—in inverted commas, of course—of the terrible events in Osh appeared in the square and described in detail alleged acts of brutality. As it transpired later, many of them had not even been in the area of the incidents over the last few days. They were taken into custody for spreading false rumours, and it seems they will be prosecuted. The more that passions were inflammed, the clearer it became that they were assuming a political hue. In particular, demands for the resignation of the government and leadership of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee are being made, for instance.

It is probably no secret to anyone that the events in Dushanbe and a number of other regions of our country have followed the same scenario. One knows exactly what they led to. You know, the voice of reason sounded once again in the appeal from the USSR Supreme Soviet to the people of Kirghizia and the appeal from the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, Supreme Soviet presidium, and Council of Ministers of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic, published in the republican press today.

The situation in Osh oblast remains difficult and tense. In the last 24 hours there have again been murders and acts of arson, and attempts have been made to provoke mass disorders. Extremists are at present actively endeavouring to inflame anti-militia sentiments. In Kara-Suyskiy rayon, a rally attended by over 300 people took place in a square in front of the rayon party committee building this morning. The participants demanded the release of curfew violators. They were all released from custody. In Aravanskiy rayon, a rally of representatives of Kirghiz and Uzbek nationality was held, at which ways of stabilizing the situation were discussed. [passage omitted]

To date, a total of 115 people have been killed since the start of the tragic events in Osh oblast. They include two militiamen and one serviceman. A total of 468 people have been injured, including 41 internal affairs employees; 350 residential houses have been burnt down; and the militia have seized 177 firearms.

Tomorrow, Monday 11 June, has been declared a day of mourning by decision of the Central Committee of the Kirghiz Communist Party and the republican Supreme Soviet presidium and Council of Ministers. State flags will be lowered throughout the territory; entertainments and other mass events will be cancelled; and the relevant changes will be made to republican radio and television programs. That is the situation here in the republic at the moment.

Kirghiz Authorities Anticipate 'Complex' Situation

PM0906194790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[G. Shipitko report: "Kirghizia: Passions Not Abating"]

[Text] The last 24 hours in the Kirghiz capital have been relatively calm with no shooting. But, in the opinion of local bodies the situation may become complex on Sunday 10 June—the deadline for the fulfillment of the demands on the republic's leadership. These demands aim to secure the resignation of the entire Central Committee Bureau and First Secretary A. Masaliyev, the revision of economic relations with neighboring republics, and, last, ethnic uniformity within the republic. I do not think that there is any need to explain how this is to be achieved. I would like to believe that the answer will take the form of a political dialogue only.

Meanwhile, aircraft arrived in Frunze 8 June carrying roughly 500 Kirghiz students from Tashkent's VUZ's [higher educational establishments]. This shows that a difficult situation has begun to develop in the neighboring republic. The newspaper has already reported that large groups of Uzbeks worried about the fate of relatives living in Kirghizia are massing in Andizhan Oblast's border areas. It has already been announced that a decree adopted by the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] president has introduced a state of emergency in the five rayons of the republic that border on Kirghizia.

Osh City has effectively found itself blockaded on all sides by large groups of Kirghizians and Uzbeks. The Osh-Khorog road is out of operation, and difficulties have developed regarding the delivery of food and other national economic freight to Tajikstan's Gorno-Badakhshan Oblast.

In Osh the writer Ch. Aytmatov, member of the Presidential Council, and Uzbek writers A. Yakubov and P. Kadyrov have appealed to the two peoples to display prudence and restraint.

The situation in Kara-Suyskiy and Uzgenskiy Rayons remains serious. The interethnic conflict has claimed new victims. A. Sutalinov, Kirghiz deputy minister of internal affairs, has described the situation as critical. In his opinion, the extremists are employing new tactics—small groups are carrying out armed attacks on preselected objectives. This is making it difficult to put up an effective fight, and is dissipating the already inadequate forces of MVD and internal troops subunits.

A republic emergency commission was set up 9 June in connection with the complication of the situation. The Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee and the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers have decided to declare 11 June a day of national mourning.

The Kirghiz MVD has announced that 102 people have been killed and 430 wounded, 348 homes and public buildings have been set on fire, and 60 automobiles have been damaged.

Kirghiz Communist Party, Government Issue Appeal

LD0906164190 Frunze Domestic Service in Russian 1209 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Unscheduled news bulletin]

[Text] An appeal by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kirghizia, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and the Council of Ministers of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic:

Dear Kirghiz and Uzbek brothers and sisters, citizens of Kirghizia! The republic is living through difficult times. A terrible misfortune has overtaken the land of Kirghizia. The tragedy that has befallen Osh Oblast has claimed the lives of tens of totally innocent people. Our hearts and the hearts of all Kirghiz citizens bleed with this acute pain. Giving way to their emotions and stirred up by the ambitions of extremist-minded elements, groups of young people have organized disturbances in Frunze, the capital of the Republic. The upshot has been the imposition of a state of emergency.

We appeal [words indistinct] to Kirghiz and Uzbeks—blood brothers in language, culture and religion—to display restraint, good sense, and humanity, and not yield to [words indistinct]. [passage indistinct] today's and future generations. As we think of tomorrow and of our [word indistinct], we say to you: Stop it! Extend a hand to one another. Restore peace to your common home. The [word indistinct] and wisdom of the fraternal peoples, which today have been subjected to a harsh trial, call for this.

The roots of the tragedy that has been played out are to be found first and foremost in the accumulated economic and social problems. These must be resolved calmly and sensibly, in the spirit of brotherhood and friendship. There is no alternative.

Kirghizia is a multiethnic republic. History has combined here a united family made up of representatives of 80 nationalities and ethnic groups. They have worked and still do work side by side, sharing the joys and concerns for one another, and strengthening the good traditions created by the older generations. So let us not stoke up passions; let us (?damp down) our ardor, crush our anger. Let us be guided by reason. Do not believe the rumors circulated by instigators; do not yield to provocations; do not allow (?firebrands) and instigators to speculate on national feelings and to do dark deeds using fine words as a screen, to confuse the young people and increase the scale of the tragedy.

We appeal to Russian citizens and to the representatives of the other people living here, to [words indistinct] workers and peasants, the intelligentsia and all who hold dear the peace and tranquility of their home, and the honor and dignity of their people, to strengthen their unity and play an active part in normalizing the situation.

The tragic events have caused enormous material and moral damage. The production rhythm of many enterprises, of transport, and of building sites has been disrupted. Without watering the crops will die, and there will be a loss in produce from the fields and farms. This will be a heavy burden for the republic's economy, and will lead to a worsening in the living standards of working people. We call on workers to return to their workplaces; on the young people to return to their classrooms and their (?production places). The Central Committee of Kirghizia, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and the Council of Ministers of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic call on the Kirghiz, the Uzbeks, and all the Republic's fraternal peoples to display goodwill and to make the effort to overcome the difficulties that have arisen, to ensure that there is peace and calm in every home.

[Signed] Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kirghizia, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic and the Council of Ministers of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic.

More on Appeal

LD0906132290 Frunze Domestic Service in Russian 1209 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Unscheduled news bulletin]

[Text] We now broadcast an appeal from the USSR Supreme Soviet to the people of the Kirgiz Soviet Socialist Republic:

Dear comrades! It is with grave concern that the USSR Supreme Soviet has learned of the tragic events that have led to human casualties and destruction. We extend our sincere and profound condolences to the families of those who have died. We call on the Kirgiz, Uzbeks, and citizens of all nationalities in the republic to display wisdom, good sense, and self-possession and not to yield to provocations, not to permit hostility and blind hatred to be stirred up between people who, for centuries, have lived together in peace and harmony, to stop all those drawn into antisocial actions, particularly young people. If the voice of reason is not heeded now, the events could have even more severe consequences.

The USSR Supreme Soviet demands that the state and law enforcement bodies of the republic and the USSR display firmness and take all steps provided for under the law to put an end to the disorders, to restore peace and security to the people, and to give them the opportunity to work normally and live in peace. All of us today desperately need national accord, close cooperation, and the help of one another. We trust and hope that sense and responsibility will triumph.

[Signed] USSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow, Kremlin, 8 June 1990.

Frunze Forces Given Order To Open Fire

AU0906143090 Paris AFP in English 1111 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Frunze, Kirghizia, June 9 (AFP)—Security forces Saturday were given the order to open fire if serious incidents occur in Frunze, capital of the Soviet central Asian republic of Kirghizia.

The order came from Felix Kulov, appointed the city's military commander after a state of emergency was imposed following clashes between Kirghiz and Uzbeks. The violence, which began Monday, has now claimed 107 lives with 467 injured. But Colonel Kulov said that "neither the militia nor the army will use their weapons, except when people's lives are threatened." He told a press conference that an official decree would be published in the press Sunday "as a warning to the population."

A spokesman for the central Asian republic's interior ministry announcing the latest casualty figures earlier, said that nearly 350 houses and 60 vehicles were set on fire during the inter-ethnic violence which flared in the Osh and Uzgen region near the border with Uzbekistan. The violence was sparked by a land dispute.

Col. Kulov said he had banned a meeting planned for Sunday in Frunze by the recently-formed Kirghizia Democratic Movement (KPK). "Yesterday I allowed them to gather, but this time I will not permit it. The law is the law," he said. And he warned KPK leader Tuchubek Turgunaliev that he would be held personally responsible for any demonstration.

On Friday about 5,000 people, mostly students, rallied in the city's Lenin Square in response to a KPK appeal to mourn victims of the violence. Col. Kulov said "concrete steps" would be taken to prevent any demonstrations. He also pledged security forces to guarantee the safety of Uzbek student residences against provocation by extremists.

Overnight the authorities in Kirghizia set up an emergency committee charged with restoring law and order to Osh and Frunze, where a state of emergency has been declared.

Coordinating the committee's work is V.A. Kuptsov, in charge of humanitarian aid on the central committee of the Soviet Communist Party, who arrived in Frunze on Friday. Apas Djumagulov, the republic's prime minister, is chairing the committee, which is to carry out an in-depth investigation of what started the trouble, which claimed victims among Kirghiz, Uzbeks and other nationalities and escalated into "arson, mass disturbances and other illegal actions", according to a press statement.

Monday has been declared a day of mourning throughout the republic, under a decree signed by the party's central committee, presidium and the government in Kirghizia.

In Frunze, Friday night was quiet, with a curfew in force. All entrances to the city were guarded.

Frunze, Osh, Andizhan Situation Updated

PM0806211590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[PRAVDA and TASS correspondents Yu. Razgulyayev, P. Volkov, and N. Pletnev report: "Emergency Situation: Tension Persists"]

[Text] **Frunze**

After the introduction of the state of emergency in Frunze City the night passed in relative calm here. This was also partly due to the extensive explanatory work which has been carried out to quash rumors and stop the spread of unreliable information. Republic leaders and students who had been at the scene of the regrettable events addressed rallies in student hostels and in squares. Today a rally to mourn and commemorate the victims of interethnic clashes in Osh was held in the city's central square.

However, in the southern part of the republic the situation remains extremely complex. In Osh itself there is sporadic sniping, and groups of armed bandits are attacking militia posts and Internal Affairs Administration buildings. Houses and stores are on fire. Fortunately, no lives have been lost in the last few days.

The situation has become even more alarming in neighboring rayons in recent days. In Uzgenskiy Rayon 24 people have been killed and 180 houses burned down. In Kara-Suyskiy Rayon attacks have been launched against the party rayon committee, the hospital, and the Rayon Internal Affairs Department. Fights and disturbances are continuing in Aravanskiy, Alayskiy, and Sovetskiy Rayons. A state of emergency was also introduced here 7 June.

Law-enforcement forces have a particularly difficult job at the moment on the oblast's borders. Only with the help of armored vehicles and reinforced troop details has it been possible to stop more than 15,000 inhabitants of Andizhan Oblast heading for Osh.

In all, 78 people have been killed and 279 injured on the territory of Osh Oblast since the beginning of the disturbances, and 149 houses and 40 vehicles have been gutted by fire. Despite the emergency measures adopted, the confiscation of weapons is proceeding very slowly. During the past alarming days 79 rifles have been confiscated.

Osh

The situation remains tense in Osh Oblast. On this occasion 350 trucks of the Pamir Motor Transport Association, heading for the "roof of the world" along the Osh—Khorog highway, became the target of the extremists' attention.

The latter mounted attacks on a number of truck convoys. Some of the drivers were brutally beaten up, others are missing. The thugs managed to seize the vehicles and make use of them for their own purposes. It proved possible to free a number of the badly injured drivers and to fly them to safety in miltary helicopters. A group of trucks warned in time by walkie-talkie changed their itinerary and arrived in Osh from Khorog by a roundabout route via Dushanbe. The association's transport operations have been totally paralyzed.

"We cannot send out drivers in such conditions," the director, Darvish Abdulaliyev, said. "Yet our shipments are needed to provide vital supplies for the population of the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast in Tajikistan.

The association's collective has asked Major General V. Goncharov, Osh Oblast commandant and Kirghiz minister of internal affairs, to ensure the safety of traffic on the Pamir highway.

Andizhan

In connection with the tragic events in Osh Oblast, Kirghiz SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], the situation in neighboring Andizhan Oblast, Uzbek SSR, and especially in bordering areas has also deteriorated. Disturbances have broken out in a number of places.

Tens of thousands of Uzbeks are living in Osh City and the rayons where disturbances have taken place. Their fate is causing concern not only among their relatives but also among all the inhabitants of Andizhan Oblast. On the eve of the mass disturbances in Osh several thousand Andizhan Oblast inhabitants had arrived with their flocks of sheep and their beehives on pastureland in Kirghizia. There are also refugees. In turn, some 70,000 Kirghizians live in Andizhan Oblast.

A state of emergency has been introduced as of 0800 hours this morning in five border rayons and in Andizhan by decree of I. Karimov, president of the Uzbek SSR, to stabilize the situation and protect citizens' rights and safety. G. Rakhimov, Uzbek SSR deputy minister of internal affairs, has been appointed commandant.

Party and soviet law-enforcement organs [as published] are taking steps to return home inhabitants of Andizhan Oblast who have ended up in Kirghizia. Explanatory work is under way at local level.

Uzbek Districts Under Emergency Named

LD0806162190 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Tashkent June 8 UZTAG-TASS—President Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan today ordered the introduction of a state of emergency in Jalalkuduk, Kurgantepin, Markhamat, Pakhtaabad and Khojaabad districts of Andijan region and in the city of Andijan.

The presidential decree proclaims the state of emergency in these areas from 8:00 am, June 8, in connection with extraordinary developments in the neighbouring Osh region, a sharp aggravation of the situation in several districts of Andijan region, attempts by certain forces to stage mass disorders and in the interests of the protection of the rights and safety of citizens.

More on State of Emergency

LD0806115490 Moscow TASS in English 1140 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Pruger]

[Text] Tashkent June 8 TASS—A state of emergency was today introduced by a decree of Uzbekistan's president Islam Karimov in a number of districts of the Andizhan region in this Soviet Central Asian republic.

This region borders on the Osh region of Kirghizia where bloody clashes between Kirghiz and Uzbeks are taking place from Monday.

Disturbances broke out over disputes when plots for housing construction were being allotted. Some 70 thousand Kirghiz reside in the Andizhan region.

Islam Karimov sent a message to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today. The message says that in connection with the events in Kirghizia the situation in the neighboring Andizhan Fergana and Namangan regions of Uzbekistan continue to aggravate.

Despite efforts of party, government and law-enforcement bodies tension persists in border districts. "There is a real danger of the events in the Osh region degenerating into a conflict between the two republics," the message says.

The Uzbek president asks in this situation for assistance at the level of the entire country and with involving the Defence Ministry. He deems it expedient to send into the region a competent commission including a member of the Political Bureau of the Soviet Communist Party and a number of people's deputies of the USSR.

A TASS correspodnent reports from Kirghizia that the situation in the Osh region aggravated yesterday. Fights and pogroms continue. Militants opened shooting.

Some 15 thousand Uzbeks gathered on the border by the afternoon. They tried to break through to the city of Osh.

Attempts were made to disarm army units opposing them. Troops had to fire into air. Armoured vehicles appeared on the scene. The crowd has been dispersed.

Since the beginning of tragic events 78 people were killed, more than 300 wounded, 249 houses and 40 cars were burned. Law enforcement bodies confiscated 79 guns.

On the demand of Frunze students, their representatives were offered an aircraft today. More than 100 people flew to Osh to get convinced that the government is doing its utmost to prevent bloodshed.

Member of the USSR Presidential Council, Kirghiz writer Chingiz Aytmatov arrived in Osh today. Prominent Uzbek writers Adyl Yakubov and Perimkul Kadyrov also arrived there. Today they appeared on local television to urge people to be tolerant and reasonable.

The situation in the region is controlled by law enforcement bodies.

'Kirghizstan' Democratic Movement Formed

LD1106090890 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 29 May 90 p 2

[Text] There was a meeting of representatives of various unregistered groups in Frunze on 26 May. Those present decided to create a public organiztion, the "Kirghizstan" Democratic Movement. According to participants, the association aims to promote the radicalization of political and economic reform in the republic and to deepen the democratization and glasnost process. A program and charter were adopted and a council, board and five co-chairmen of the newly formed movement were elected.

Tajikistan Curbs Exports of Food, Consumer Goods

PM0806153790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 7 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] A republic Council of Ministers resolution on temporary restrictions on exports of certain consumer goods and types of agricultural output from the Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] has come into force.

[Reporter] Dushanbe Airport is Tajikistan's main air harbor. The check-in desks are unusually quiet for this summer flight period. Ticket sales and check-in are proceeding calmly and without the commotion usual at any airport. Incidentally, there has been a noticeable decline in passenger numbers. There are no hard-pressed young people with huge bags and trunks filled with who knows what.

[R.Kh. Rustamov, chief of the inspection service, identified by caption] Since the adoption of the resolution, I think there have been fewer speculators trying to take things out. They've gotten more cautious. Hardly anything's getting out. As for the goods that we confiscate from passengers who still try to take things out—we hand them over to the commission store in our airport.

[Reporter] What kinds of goods are these, mainly?

[Rustamov] Mainly we're getting coffee at the moment and condensed milk—that's to say, foodstuffs. And radios and electronics.

[Reporters] Goods being sent out of the republic are inspected not only at the airport. Checks are also conducted at post offices, railroad stations, and on highways to neighboring republics. Incidentally, yesterday internal affairs organs detained several truckloads of early vegetables whose enterprising owners were trying to move them out of the republic for speculative purposes. The resolution will have absolutely no effect on contractual shipments to all-Union stocks.

Kazakh Plenum Lists New Party Officials

LD1106032590 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 0100 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] On 9 June, the first plenum of the Kazakhstan Communist Party [CP] Central Committee, the authority of whose members was confirmed by the 17th Congress of the Kazakhstan Communist Party, was held. The plenum was opened by Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, comprising 13 members and three candidate members of the Politburo. After that candidacies for members and candidate members of the Politburo of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, and for the position of secretaries of the Central Committee were introduced. As a result of secret ballot, Anufriyev has been elected member of the Politburo and second secretary of the Central Committee; Dzhanibekov has been elected member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee: Baydzhanov has been elected member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, and head of the department for forecasting and analysing socioeconomic processes; Dvurechenskiy has been elected member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee, head of the agrarian department. Asanbeyev, chairman of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, Karamanov, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers, Kozlov, deputy director of the Party History Institute attached to the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, (Kolbik), worker at the Alma-Ata preserved fruit factory, (?Biberovskiy), head of the Eastern Border District of the USSR KGB; (Yefisov), excavator-mechanic at Kongr-at mine of the Balkash-neft production association in Dzhezkazgan Oblast, Ruzakunov, secretary of the Kirov Kolkhoz party committee in Taldy-Kurgan Oblast and deputy chairman of the republican council of primary party organization secretaries, Tolebekov, first secretary of the Alma-Ata oblast party committee, have been elected to members of the Politburo.

Abdikarimov, head of the organizational party and cadres work department of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, Dzhaksilokov, chairman of the Kazak Republican Trade Union Council, Tasmagambetov, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Komsomol Central Committee have been elected to candidate members of the Politburo.

The plenum set up the commissions of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee. The following were approved: Anufriyev as chairman of the commission on the matters of the organizational party and cadre work; Dzhanibekov as a chairman of the ideological commission; Bayzhanov as chairman of the commission on socioeconomic matters; Dvurechenskiy as chairman on the matters of agrarian policy; Asanbeyev, as chairman of the commission on the matters of youth.

The plenum confirmed the following as heads of the departments of the Central Committee: Abdikarimov, Organizational Party and Cadres Work Department; (Sultanov) Ideological Department; (Shepil) General Department; Brot as administrator of the Central Committee; Takuov as chairman of the Party Control Commission attached to the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee.

The plenum approved the editor in chiefs of the republican party newspapers SOTSIALISTIK KAZAKHSTAN, KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA as Murtazayev and Ignatov, KAZAKHSTAN KOMMUNISY, PARTINIYA KAZAKHSTANA journals as Ismaylo and (Shishnakov). TAking part in the plenum work were Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, (Shipirov), head of a sector of the department of party construction and cadres of the CPSU Central Committee.